91-06521/

AN INVENTORY OF LAND, LOTS AND SERVICING CAPACITY FOR SELECTED ALBERTA MUNICIPALITIES

VOLUME I TEXT

Alberta Municipal Affairs
Planning Services Division
Research and Development Branch

May 1987

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I
TEXT

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
FIGURE 1 - RELATIVE LEVELS OF VACANT LOT INVENTORIES AND PERCENTAGE PUBLIC SECTOR OWNERSHIP	4
INTRODUCTION	6
Purpose of Report	6
Overall Study Objectives	6
Municipalities Studied	6
Data Collection	7
Definitions	8
CHAPTER 1 - SERVICED VACANT LOTS BY LAND USE AND OWNERSHIP	9
Tabular Information	9
Data Sources	9
Data Evaluation	9
Observations on Serviced Residential Lot Inventories	10
Observations on Serviced Commercial Lot Inventories	11
Observations on Serviced Industrial Lot Inventories	12
Observations on Serviced Institutional and Unspecified Use Lot Inventories	13
CHAPTER 2 - LAND AND LOTS IN THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT BY LAND USE AND OWNERSHIP	15
Tabular Information	15
Data Sources	15
Data Evaluation	15
Observations on Land and Lots Proposed for Residential Development	16
Observations on Land and Lots Proposed for Commercial Development	17
Observations on Land and Lots Proposed for Industrial Development	18
CHAPTER 3 - MUNICIPAL GROWTH AND LAND ABSORPTION	19
Observations on the Intensity of Residential Land Use	20
Observations on Population Carrying Capacities of Residential Land Inventories	21
Observations on Municipal Residential Growth Capacity	21

Contents of Volume 1 (continued) .....

	Page
Observations Concerning the Absorption Rate of Residential Land and Lots Inventories	23
Observations on Commercial and Industrial Growth Potential	25
CHAPTER 4 - MUNICIPAL SERVICING INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITIES	26
Observations on Water Supply and Water Trunk Systems Capacity	27
Observations on Sewage Treatment and Sewer Trunk Systems Capacity	28
Observations on Storm Water Management Systems Capacity	28
APPENDIX 1 - MUNICIPALITIES SURVEYED	30

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A survey, to identify inventories of vacant and developing land and lots, was carried out in 81 municipalities selected by the Municipal Administration Services Division of Alberta Municipal Affairs. Consequently, it should be realized that these findings cannot be extrapolated across the province. The situation of inventories may be better, or worse, elsewhere.

The report has five main sections:

1. An introduction which outlines the purpose, objectives and data collection process of the study;

2. Data and observations on the inventories and ownership of vacant, serviced lots which are immediately marketable;

3. Data and observations on inventories of land and lots which are presently in the development process (i.e., where zoning and/or subdivision processes have commenced but the lots are not, as yet, saleable);

4. Observations on municipal rates of growth and the potential absorption of the land and lot inventories;

5. Observations on the capacity of municipal servicing infrastructure relative to the population carrying capacity of residential land and lot inventories.

The data has been assembled in tabular form and is published in the accompanying Volume 2 Tables. Cross references to specific series of tables are provided in this Volume. From this data observations are made and a series of conclusions have been drawn which are reported in the text of this report.

1. In many of the municipalities that entered into land banking, and land development activities during the 1970's and early 1980's the ongoing recession has created ongoing concern.

   Many of the communities are now faced with the problem of carrying the costs of excessively large inventories of land and lots. With slow or no growth, these inventories and the associated debts (immediate or deferred) have or will have a direct impact on municipal finances.

2. Financial problems may be related to a number of scenarios. Debts to the province have been incurred where the municipality participated directly in the land banking process.

Municipalities made investments in infrastructure anticipating growth. Slow growth has resulted in under-used servicing investments which impact on municipal debt even where the private sector was the developer.

In some cases the financial failure of the private developer has resulted in the responsibility for partially completed developments being assumed by the municipality through tax recovery processes.

3. About half the municipalities studied have inventories of serviced residential land, or land under development, capable of accommodating more than ten years of growth at the levels that were experienced in the rapid growth period 1976-1982.

4. In most cases where the public sector is active, its share of the market is sufficiently large that decisions on how the publicly owned inventory is marketed will have a major influence on the price of land and lots in the communities studied.

   This is particularly true of the industrial land market where 60% of the proposed industrial land is under public control. In 15 of the 35 communities with industrial land inventories, the public sector is the sole developer.

   In the absence of growth driven by the economy, the rapid release of land and lots by the public sector could be very disruptive to the remaining private development industry and to the resale real estate markets.

5. This work has identified a number of shortcomings with the information available to make land development decisions in the communities studied.

   The data on the number of vacant serviced lots in the communities was generally accurate but not readily accessible. However, the information on the area of land available in serviced lots, the areas of land in the development process and the inventory of raw land available for long term growth was generally poor or non-existent.

6. An expanded inventory of vacant land and lots should be undertaken in order to understand the land market and supply across the province prior to any comprehensive actions being undertaken to dispose of public lot inventories through price write-downs.

   The inventory should be collected and stored in a way which will permit regular updating. This will provide an ongoing gauge to the ability of the marketplace to accommodate future needs and to the vulnerability of municipalities to overextended investments in growth capacity.

The following figure identifies relative levels of inventories of land and lots for residential, commercial and industrial uses. This figure should only be used as an indication of the pattern of inventories in the communities studied and not taken as an absolute determination of the presence or absence of a problem. After all, any level of inventory will become a problem if the community does not grow in the future. Those communities whose inventories are more than 50% controlled by the public sector will present particular problems in the orderly disposal of land and lots in a continuing climate of slow growth.

FIGURE 1

RELATIVE LEVELS OF VACANT LOT INVENTORIES
AND PERCENTAGE PUBLIC SECTOR OWNERSHIP

	RESIDENTIAL INVENTORY		COMMERCIAL INVENTORY		INDUSTRIAL INVENTORY	
	years of capacity	% public owned	lots per capita	% public owned	lots per capita	% public owned
ALIX	V. HIGH	92	HIGH	38	LOW	0
ATHABASCA	V. HIGH	61	LOW	53	HIGH	0
BARNWELL	LOW	50	NONE	N/A	NONE	N/A
BARRHEAD	AVG	41	LOW	0	AVG	49
BASHAW	V. HIGH	100	AVG	100	V. HIGH	100
BEISEKER	HIGH	74	HIGH	0	HIGH	100
BOWDEN	HIGH	67	LOW	0	LOW	33
BOYLE	HIGH	55	HIGH	0	NONE	N/A
BRETON	V. HIGH	61	HIGH	38	AVG	20
BROOKS	LOW	0	LOW	0	LOW	100
BRUDERHEIM	HIGH	0	HIGH	0	LOW	0
CALMAR	HIGH	0	LOW	0	HIGH	0
CANMORE	HIGH	48	LOW	48	HIGH	100
CARSTAIRS	AVG	6	LOW	15	HIGH	100
CAYLEY	AVG	71	NONE	N/A	NONE	N/A
CLYDE	V. HIGH	22	V. HIGH	36	V. HIGH	21
CORONATION	HIGH	50	HIGH	48	AVG	47
COUTTS	HIGH	62	HIGH	100	HIGH	100
DEVON	AVG	34	LOW	50	HIGH	100
DIDSBURY	AVG	23	LOW	14	LOW	0
DRAYTON VALLEY	HIGH	47	LOW	0	LOW	0
ECKVILLE	HIGH	100	NONE	N/A	NONE	N/A
EDSON	AVG	76	AVG	18	LOW	24
FAIRVIEW	HIGH	20	AVG	4	AVG	4
FOREMOST	V. HIGH	48	AVG	67	AVG	100
FORT ASSINIBONE	V. HIGH	27	HIGH	17	NONE	N/A
FORT MACLEOD	V. HIGH	83	LOW	50	V. HIGH	97
FOX CREEK	V. HIGH	100	HIGH	100	NONE	N/A
GIBBONS	AVG	18	LOW	100	LOW	100
GRANDE CACHE	V. HIGH	97	LOW	100	LOW	100
GRANUM	V. HIGH	61	HIGH	30	HIGH	100
HANNA	AVG	79	LOW	0	LOW	0
HIGH LEVEL	LOW	99	AVG	100	AVG	100
HIGH PRAIRIE	HIGH	82	HIGH	3	AVG	0
HIGH RIVER	LOW	100	LOW	100	LOW	100
HYTHE	V. HIGH	79	V. HIGH	12	HIGH	30
INNISFAIL	LOW	46	LOW	30	LOW	100
IRVINE	V. HIGH	92	V. HIGH	43	LOW	100
LAC LA BICHE	HIGH	87	NONE	N/A	LOW	100
LACOMBE	AVG	37	NONE	N/A	LOW	100
LINDEN	HIGH	98	V. HIGH	64	AVG	75
LOMOND	V. HIGH	0	AVG	100	AVG	100
MANNING	HIGH	45	AVG	0	HIGH	0

Figure 1 (continued) ....

	RESIDENTIAL INVENTORY		COMMERCIAL INVENTORY		INDUSTRIAL INVENTORY	
	years of capacity	% public owned	lots per capita	% public owned	lots per capita	% public owned
MANNVILLE	HIGH	55	LOW	0	HIGH	95
MAYERTHORPE	HIGH	98	HIGH	77	V. HIGH	0
MORINVILLE	LOW	8	AVG	9	AVG	2
NAMPA	HIGH	2	HIGH	0	LOW	0
NOBLEFORD	AVG	82	AVG	100	HIGH	100
OLDS	HIGH	29	LOW	10	HIGH	23
ONOWAY	HIGH	0	LOW	0	V. HIGH	100
PENHOLD	NONE	45	LOW	0	LOW	12
PICTURE BUTTE	LOW	17	AVG	6	AVG	100
PLAMONDON	V. HIGH	0	V. HIGH	0	NONE	N/A
REDCLIFF	HIGH	0	HIGH	0	HIGH	0
REDWATER	AVG	0	LOW	0	HIGH	100
RIMBEY	V. HIGH	3	AVG	4	LOW	0
ROCKYFORD	V. HIGH	82	AVG	33	LOW	0
SMOKY LAKE	V. HIGH	0	AVG	0	LOW	0
ST. PAUL	LOW	6	LOW	0	LOW	33
STANDARD	V. HIGH	67	NONE	N/A	V. HIGH	100
STETTLER	HIGH	91	AVG	14	LOW	59
STONY PLAIN	AVG	0	LOW	100	AVG	100
STRATHMORE	HIGH	32	AVG	15	AVG	53
SWAN HILLS	V. HIGH	8	AVG	50	AVG	100
THORHILD	V. HIGH	0	AVG	0	AVG	0
THORSBY	V. HIGH	0	HIGH	40	LOW	0
TURNER VALLEY	HIGH	52	LOW	0	AVG	12
TWO HILLS	V. HIGH	94	V. HIGH	96	AVG	45
VAUXHALL	HIGH	33	V. HIGH	14	LOW	0
VEGREVILLE	V. HIGH	5	LOW	14	AVG	68
VULCAN	V. HIGH	84	LOW	75	HIGH	4
WARBURG	V. HIGH	1	V. HIGH	0	HIGH	86
WHITECOURT	AVG	73	LOW	30	AVG	27

NOTES:

	YEARS OF GROWTH CAPACITY	COMMERCIAL LOTS PER CAPITA	INDUSTRIAL LOTS PER CAPITA
LOW	Less than 3 years	Less than .0075	Less than .006
AVG	3 to 5 years	.008 - .015	.007 - .012
HIGH	6 to 10 years	.016 - .030	.013 - .024
V. HIGH	More than 10 years	Greater than .030	Greater than .024

AN INVENTORY OF LAND, LOTS AND SERVICING CAPACITY FOR SELECTED ALBERTA TOWNS AND VILLAGES

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide a synopsis of the data collected concerning the availability, ownership and development status of land and vacant lots for residential, commercial and industrial land uses in 73 selected municipalities. The capacity of their infrastructure to service future development is also examined. It was believed that an objective consideration of municipal and private land inventories was needed in order to study the position of some of the municipalities which had entered into land banking and development programs either through provincial programs or on their own initiative.

This report summarizes the information obtained on a number of the pertinent variables. Tabular data on the inventories of lots and services available in each municipality is provided in the accompanying Volume 2.

Overall Study Objectives

The objectives of the study were:

1. To collect data on the availability and ownership of land in various stages of development in selected Alberta municipalities.

2. To provide data on land and lots availability to the Municipal Administrative Services Division, Alberta Municipal Affairs.

3. To examine the problems of assembling and analyzing data on land and services ownership and availability.

4. To examine existing municipal services and infrastructure to assess the ability of the municipality to accommodate new development with minimal direct investment in additional infrastructure.

Municipalities Studied

At the request of the Municipal Administrative Services Division, 54 towns, 26 villages, 1 city and 3 rural municipalities were chosen for consideration in the project. It was decided to collect data only on the 81 urban communities since it was judged to be impractical to assemble data on the proposed use and ownership of 'vacant' land in a rural context. The municipalities surveyed are listed at the end of the report in Appendix 1.

Data Collection

The study was introduced to municipal administrators by a letter from the Municipal Administrative Services Division. This was followed up by a phone call from the project staff to explain the nature of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was then mailed with a set of supplementary instructions to assist the administrator in accurately completing the survey. The municipal administrators were very cooperative and completed the surveys as quickly as their other work pressures allowed. Some municipalities had the data readily available and were able to rapidly and accurately complete the questionnaire. In other cases their staff had to be assigned to generate the requested information.

A very high response to the questionnaire was obtained. Overall, the response rate was 94% with 100% response from the villages and 91% from the city and towns surveyed.

The regional planning commissions were contacted by mail to inform them of the study and were asked for land use bylaw maps and plan index maps. This information, where available, was quickly provided.

Alberta Environment's Municipal Engineering Branch of the Standards and Approvals Division made their files accessible on the capacity of municipal water and sewer systems. This data was used as a comparison with the information on servicing capacities which was obtained from the municipalities.

Analysis indicated that the data on the inventories of vacant lots are the most accurate, followed by the information on the numbers of lots under development. The quality of the data on the area of vacant land and lots under development varied widely. It was evident that some municipalities did not have land area data and, in others, the data was inaccurate or the questions asked were misinterpreted. In some cases the area of land indicated as vacant exceeded the total area zoned for that use.

The reader is warned to look at the supplementary data in Volume 2 critically since derived measures, such as density and growth capacity are significantly affected by the initial data. Major areas of data insufficiency are noted in the text.

In general, the responses to the study were excellent both in terms of the number of municipalities responding and in the quality of data supplied by the municipalities.

Definitions

DEVELOPED LAND is defined as vacant lots which are registered, fully serviced and available for the immediate development of a residential, commercial or industrial use.

LAND UNDER DEVELOPMENT is defined as:

1. Land designated under the land use by-law for a commercial, industrial, residential or other land use where subdivision to create lots for the proposed use has not yet commenced. This situation is typified by the pre-zoning of larger blocks of land for future residential development.

2. Land which is under an active application for subdivision which has not yet been designated for the proposed use under the land use by-law.

3. Land under active application for subdivision, where the land uses have been designated under the land use by-law but where the registration of the subdivision application has not proceeded.

4. Land where subdivision plans have proceeded through final registration prior to the installation of roads and/or utility infrastructure. Although it appears that, in theory, these lots could be sold, the actual sale and development of the final uses cannot proceed until the owner or the municipality installs servicing.

RAW LAND is defined as land designated under the land use by-law as urban reserve (holding districts) or, in the case of one or two municipalities, as agricultural.

CHAPTER I

SERVICED VACANT LOTS BY LAND USE AND OWNERSHIP

Tabular Information

A series of tables has been prepared indicating the number of vacant residential, commercial, industrial and miscellaneous lots by ownership for each municipality. These tables are presented in three alternative ways:

1. by the name of the municipality;
2. by the area of the inventory in acres, and;
3. by the number of vacant lots.

It should be emphasized that the data in the tables is identical. The only difference is in the ordering of the information for ease of review by the reader. If the reader seeks information on a specific municipality, the use of the tables ordered by name would be recommended. If seeking to find the municipalities with the largest or smallest inventories using the other tables would be more appropriate.

For each land use a measure of vacant and developing lots per capita was developed. This measure can provide an "intuitive" measure of excess capacity. For example, a commercial inventory of 0.03 lots per capita would indicate that there is a vacant commercial lot for every 30 people or approximately 10 households. Unless the town is growing very rapidly this would likely constitute an excess inventory.

Data Sources

Data for these tables were obtained from questionnaires completed by municipal administrators in June and July 1986. The data on land areas zoned for various uses were obtained by the planimeter measurement of land use by-law maps. The percentage of land vacant were calculated from area of vacant lots relative to the gross area zoned for a specific use. In many cases, the areas of vacant lots which were provided by the municipalities were given in "net acres" and the areas measured were in "gross acres".

Data Evaluation

The data on the inventory of vacant serviced lots by use and ownership is believed to be generally reliable. The municipalities seem to have depended primarily upon assessment records for this data. However less weight should be given to the land area data. Many municipalities did not have this. Some did not indicate areas for vacant lots and others provided approximate lot sizes only. Readers of these tables should note that 12 municipalities indicated significant inventories of residential lots but showed no vacant land. This observation also applies to 10 communities with vacant commercial lots and 9 municipalities with vacant industrial lots.

Observations on Serviced Residential Lot Inventories

Magnitude of Residential Lot Inventories

It is considered normal and advantageous for all municipalities to have an inventory of serviced lots available to accommodate residential development as it occurs. A normal guideline is to have a minimum inventory of serviced lots capable of accommodating at least one years growth. Also it is true that many of the municipalities studied are small and, as a result, a minimal development of only a few residential lots may accommodate several years of growth even in "good times". The magnitude of these inventories should be considered bearing this in mind.

Together, the 73 municipalities have an inventory of 7,398 serviced vacant residential lots which is an average of 101 vacant residential lots per municipality. There is a wide range in the residential lot inventories of the individual municipalities ranging from a low of 4 lots in Cayley to a high of 553 lots in Canmore.

Table 1.1.5 presents data on the number of vacant serviced residential lots per capita. An examination of residential lots per capita can indicate the relative magnitude of the problem of excess inventory. If the average household size is approximately 3.0 people we can make an assumption that there should be somewhat less than 0.33 occupied lots per capita given an allowance for multiple family housing. If we seek to maintain an inventory of serviced lots to allow for one to two years growth we might seek to maintain an inventory of vacant lots of up to 10% of existing stock. On that basis it might be justified to retain an inventory of vacant lots per capita of 0.033 (0.1 x 0.33 lots/capita). Examining the data shows that 52 of the 73 communities had inventories in excess of this ratio. Even some larger centres such as Canmore, Vegreville and Strathmore had ratios three times larger than this guideline.

Ownership Mix

Considering the inventory of vacant residential lots, 61% is under private sector control, 23% is in provincial government ownership and 16% is owned by the municipalities. The remaining lots are in provincial government ownership.

Of the 10 municipalities with the largest lot inventories only one, Canmore, has more publicly owned vacant lots than private. However, of the next 10 largest inventories, 6 are predominantly in public control.

The largest inventories of publicly controlled vacant residential lots are found in Canmore, Whitecourt, Grande Cache, Fox Creek, Athabasca, Hythe, Stettler, and High Level. It should be noted that a number of these communities are former new towns and this likely is a major factor in the level of public land ownership.

Volume 2 Tabular Data References

Table 1.1 Inventory of Vacant Serviced Residential lots

Table 1.1.1	By Ownership (ordered by municipal name)
Table 1.1.2	By Ownership (ordered by acreage of vacant serviced land)
Table 1.1.3	By Ownership (ordered by number of serviced lots)
Table 1.1.4	By Vacant Residential Lots per Capita (ordered by municipal name)
Table 1.1.5	By Vacant Residential Lots per Capita (ordered by lots per capita)

Observations on Serviced Commercial Lot Inventories

Magnitude of Vacant Commercial Lot Inventory

As might be expected the magnitude of the inventories of commercial land and lots is much smaller than the residential inventories. The total inventory is ~~1298~~ 1293 vacant commercial parcels in the 73 municipalities. Seven municipalities indicated no inventory of commercial lots and an additional 25 had less than 10 vacant parcels. It is difficult to assess whether the inventories of commercial lots can be called excessive since demand will relate to the service function of the community and the market trade area served. However, it can be noted that some communities appear to have an inventory of lots and commercial land disproportionate to their size. These include ~~Vauxhall, Hythe, and Plamondon.~~ Warburg, Hythe and Irvine

Ownership Mix

Of the vacant commercial lots, 74% are under private sector control, 23% are under municipal ownership and only 3% are provincially owned. Noteworthy are those communities where the public ownership of the inventories of vacant commercial land and lots is predominant. These include Fox Creek, Two Hills and Stony Plain. High Level's commercial land inventory is totally under provincial control and these lots form the majority (27/42) of the total provincial interests in commercial lots.

Table 1.2.4 indicates the number of vacant commercial lots per capita. While this measure cannot be directly related to the growth of the community for the reasons noted above significant deviation from the average number of vacant commercial lots per capita may suggest excess capacity in this inventory. Overall, the communities had ~~.015~~ .035 vacant commercial lots per capita. ~~Breton, Clyde, Fort Assiniboine, High Prairie, Hythe, Irvine, Plamondon, Redcliff, Two Hills, Vauxhall and Warburg all had inventories of more than .030 vacant commercial lots per capita.~~

Breton, Plamondon, Clyde, Vauxhall, Warburg, Hythe and Irvine all had inventories of more than .030 vacant commercial lots per capita.

Tabular References to Volume 2

Table 1.2 Inventory of Vacant Serviced Commercial Lots

Table 1.2.1	By Ownership (ordered by municipal name and status)
Table 1.2.2	By Ownership (ordered by acreage of vacant serviced land)
Table 1.2.3	By Ownership (ordered by number of serviced lots)
Table 1.2.4	By Vacant Commercial Lots per Capita (ordered by municipal name and status)
Table 1.2.5	By Vacant Commercial Lots per Capita (ordered by lots per capita)

Observations on Serviced Industrial Lot Inventories

Magnitude of Vacant Industrial Lot Inventory

Vacant industrial lots are available in 60 of the 73 communities studied. These 60 communities share a total inventory of 1,054 lots. The total vacant industrial area was indicated as 1,179 acres. This should be considered a significant underestimate since 9 municipalities indicated that they had vacant industrial lots but did not provide any information on the area of the vacant parcels.

The demand for industrial land is conditional upon the nature of the economic development being experienced in a community and the particular needs of the specific industries which seek to locate in the area. Consequently, it is difficult to determine absolutely what can be classed as an "excess inventory."

Some communities do have significantly larger inventories of industrial land than others of comparable size. The validity of the level of their holdings might be examined in more depth. Notably, Clyde, Calmar, Hythe, Onoway, Standard, Morinville and Olds appear to have relatively large inventories of land and lots in absolute terms and relative to their size.

Ownership Mix

The ownership of industrial land and lot inventories is noteworthy. This is the only major land use class where public ownership of the inventory exceeds private sector control in the communities studied.

Of the vacant industrial lots, 60% are in public control, including 45% in municipal hands and 15% in provincial ownership. In 24 of the 60 municipalities which have industrial inventories, the ownership is totally in public hands. These communities include Canmore, Carstairs, Stony Plain, High Level, Redwater, Innisfail, Devon, Calmar, Swan Hills, Onoway, Standard, Picture Butte, Bashaw, Grande Cache, Foremost, Beiseker, Brooks, Lac La Biche, Granum, Gibbons, Lacombe, High River, Coutts and Lomond.

It would seem that these municipalities actively participated in the industrial land development sector hoping to be able to attract new economic growth and tax base to their jurisdictions despite there being little or no private sector interest in industrial land development in their area.

In only 16 of the municipalities studied is the private sector the sole player in industrial development. Only in a third of the communities is there joint public/private sector participation in industrial land development and sales.

Tabular References to Volume 2

Table 1.3 Inventory of Vacant Serviced Industrial Lots

Table 1.3.1	By Ownership (ordered by municipal name and status)
Table 1.3.2	By Ownership (ordered by acreage of vacant serviced land)
Table 1.3.3	By Ownership (ordered by number of serviced lots)
Table 1.3.4	By Vacant Industrial lots per Capita (ordered by municipal name and status)
Table 1.3.5	By Vacant Industrial Lots per Capita (ordered by lots per capita)

Observations on Serviced Institutional and Unspecified Use lot Inventories

Magnitude of Lot Inventories for Institutional or Miscellaneous Uses

This category includes vacant parcels which are zoned direct control or have been zoned for a public use. Only 12 municipalities have indicated that they have any inventory of this type. Table 1.4.1 provides data only for these communities. Thorsby indicated 74 parcels without a defined use. It is believed that this is a mobile home subdivision. Except for this one case, the number and area of unspecified use land and lots were not significant. Some municipalities indicated that they had inventories of lots in this category but also indicated that the future use was to be for mobile homes. In such cases these parcels were coded as vacant residential lots for the analysis. It is interesting to consider that mobile homes are still not identified as a residential use in some communities.

Ownership Mix

These vacant lands were predominantly under private sector control (139/148 lots or 94%).

Tabular References to Volume 2

Table 1.4 Inventory of Vacant Miscellaneous Lots

By Ownership (Tabulated only for municipalities indicating lot inventories in this category)

CHAPTER 2

INVENTORY OF LAND AND LOTS IN PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT BY LAND USE AND OWNERSHIP

Tabular Information

Series of tables have been prepared indicating the numbers and ownership of lots in each municipality under development for residential, commercial, industrial and miscellaneous land uses. These can be compared with the previous set of tables which examined the inventories of land and lots which were already subdivided, serviced and available for sale. The tables on land and lots under development are presented in the same formats as the previous series:

1. by the name of the municipality;
2. by the area of the inventory in acres, and;
3. by the number of vacant lots.

It should be emphasized that the data in each set of these tables is identical. The differences lie in the ordering of the information for the ease of analysis by the reader. If the reader seeks information on a specific municipality the use of the tables ordered by name would be the easiest. If seeking to find the municipalities with the largest or smallest inventories the use of the other tables would be appropriate.

Data Sources

Data for these tables was obtained from the questionnaires completed for the subject municipalities in 1986.

Data Evaluation

The accuracy of the data on number of proposed lots and the area of land actually under development appears to be of variable quality. It should be remembered that the processes of subdivision approval often alters the number of lots finally registered from those originally proposed. In some cases it became clear that the municipality did not have accurate data on the areas of parcels under development. Long term plans such as area structure plans were sometimes indicated as being under development even though the lands were still zoned urban reserve and there was no active subdivision application. Consequently, the reader should exercise some caution in using the information found in this series of tables without evaluating whether the data is "reasonable." For example, it is not reasonable to have more land under development for a use than is zoned in total for that use.

Observations on Land and Lots Proposed for Residential Development

Magnitude of Inventory of Land and Lots Under Development for Residential Uses

The municipalities stated that more land is in the process of being developed for residential uses than is presently vacant, serviced and available for residential development (1,913 acres vs 1,307 acres). However, fewer total lots are being proposed (2,974 proposed lots compared to 7,398 vacant lots). This may be explained by the fact that this category includes large blocks of prezoned land which shows on municipal records as a single parcel but would include numerous lots if further subdivided.

Numbers of lots in the residential development process in the communities of Swan Hills, Bruderheim, Irvine, Two Hills, Foremost, Mayerthorpe, Vulcan, Plamondon, Lomond, Coutts and Fort Assiniboine appear large compared to the present size of the communities.

Municipalities that have areas of land in the development process which appear disproportionately high, when compared to the size of the community, include Hanna, High Prairie, Bowden, Coronation, Bashaw, Plamondon, Barnwell, Thorhild, Irvine and Calmar.

Ownership Mix

Of the proposed residential lots under development, 37% are being developed by the municipality and an additional 14% by the provincial government. Particularly high levels of public activity in the residential land development process have been observed in Edson, Strathmore, Fort Macleod, Stettler, Irvine, Grande Cache, Two Hills, Vulcan, High Prairie, High River, Coutts and Smoky Lake.

Examining the ownership of the total area of land under development gives a slightly different picture. Of the 1,913 acres under development, 1,157 acres, or 60%, are in private hands. The interpretation of this data would be that the private sector's holdings apparently are at an earlier stage in the development process. The lands have been pre-zoned but an application to subdivide has not been initiated which would indicate the proposed number of parcels.

Large developing residential land holdings controlled by municipalities are found in Hanna, Fort Macleod, Strathmore, Irvine, Mannville, Mayerthorpe, Two Hills and Stettler. Large provincial interests in developing residential land are found in Bowden, Edson, Bashaw and Canmore.

Tabular References to Volume 2

Table 2.1 Residential Land and Lots in Process of Development

Table 2.1.1	By Ownership (ordered by municipal name)
Table 2.1.2	By Ownership (ordered by acreage of land proposed for residential development)
Table 2.1.3	By Ownership (ordered by number of proposed residential lots)

Observations on Land and Lots Proposed for Commercial Development

Magnitude of Inventories of Land and Lots under Development for Commercial Uses

Only 33% of the municipalities indicated any land or lots in the process of development for commercial land use. Of the 25 municipalities where commercial land was being developed, 21 indicated that less than 10 parcels were being created. This seems generally to represent a reasonable scale of commercial development activity given the size of the communities under study.

The data on the area of land under commercial development was more erratic. More than 20 acres of commercial development are proposed in each of the municipalities of Canmore, Fort Macleod, Irvine, St.Paul, Stettler and Strathmore. As noted previously the land area data may be suspected particularly considering the probable scale of commercial development in the smaller urban centres.

Ownership Mix

The public sector owns 70% of the 402 acres proposed for commercial development. This contrasts to the ownership of the proposed lots, 62% of which are under private sector ownership. This may indicate either inaccuracies in the land area data or that the development of the privately controlled land is further along in the development processes. It may also be the case that municipalities have prezoned large parcels in hopes of being able to attract future commercial development.

Tabular References to Volume 2

Table 2.2 Commercial Land and Lots in Process of Development

Table 2.2.1	By Ownership (ordered by municipal name)
Table 2.2.2	By Ownership (ordered by acreage of land proposed for commercial development)
Table 2.2.3	By Ownership (ordered by number of proposed commercial lots)

Observations on Land and Lots Proposed for Industrial Development

Magnitude of Inventories of Land and Lots Under Development for Industrial Uses

Of all the municipalities, 48% indicated that industrial land development was underway or had been allowed for by prezoning in their community. Twelve communities had more than 10 industrial lots under development and 23 had 10 lots or fewer underway. Communities with relatively large development proposals, in terms of the number of lots under consideration, included Fort Macleod, Bashaw, Devon, Vegreville, Mayerthorpe, Whitecourt, Manning, Mannville, Vulcan and Nobleford.

Areas of land under development for industry were indicated in 35 of the communities. Only 7 municipalities indicated less than 10 acres of proposed industrial development, 8 municipalities indicated that 10 to 20 acres were proposed, 15 indicated that 20 to 90 acres were proposed and 5 communities indicated that more than 100 acres were proposed. Total acreage proposed for industrial development in the communities is 1,497 acres.

To place this figure in perspective, the City of Calgary's industrial land consumption in 1985-1986 was 46.3 acres and in 1981-1982, 223.6 acres. If much of the proposed industrial land in these communities actually reaches the market, the retained inventories are likely to be large for many years.

Ownership Mix

Of the proposed industrial lots, 74% are being developed by the public sector. Public initiatives in the development of industrial land apparently are stronger and more pervasive than for other land uses. Approximately 60% of the land area proposed for industrial development is in municipal or provincial ownership. Of the 35 communities where industrial land developments are proposed, the public sector is the sole developer in 15. Particularly large public land holdings for future industrial development are found in Stettler, Lacombe, Fort Macleod, Innisfail, Vegreville, Two Hills, Bashaw, Devon, Stony Plain and Mannville.

Tabular References to Volume 2

Table 2.3 Industrial Land and Lots in Process of Development

Table 2.3.1	By Ownership (ordered by municipal name)
Table 2.3.2	By Ownership (ordered by acreage of land proposed for industrial development)
Table 2.3.3	By Ownership (ordered by number of proposed industrial lots)

CHAPTER 3

MUNICIPAL GROWTH AND LAND ABSORPTION

It seems reasonable that every municipality should have an inventory of land, lots and services capable of accommodating growth when it occurs. However, the optimum size of an inventory is a matter of considerable judgment. Factors such as the rate of population growth, economic development opportunities, the density of development accepted in the community and physical development constraints associated with land under development must all be considered. Not all of this type of information could be obtained for the study.

In designing the study, it was decided to ask the municipal administrators directly how they perceived the growth prospects of their communities. It was recognized that these opinions would be subjective but hopefully the judgments would be based upon a "feel" for what was happening in the community and what was likely to happen in the future.

The responses to these questions fell into three groups. One group frankly admitted that they were uncertain about how their community would grow in the future given the present structural problems with Alberta's economy. The second group tended to project the future based upon recent experiences with lot sales and development. The third group of municipalities did not respond. It was judged that these responses did not provide enough direction to evaluate the levels of inventory.

In order to provide comparable information on levels of inventory in all the communities being studied growth and land consumption estimates were prepared by the study for each municipality.

The capacity of the inventories to accommodate growth was calculated and this capacity was related to the range of growth rates experienced by each municipality over the last decade.

Two approaches for estimating the capacity of the land and lot inventories were developed. The first approach made the assumption that new development would occur at the same density as had developed to date within the community. The population carrying capacity of vacant and developing land was defined as the area of those lands multiplied by the present density of occupied residential land within the community. This approach likely results in an underestimation of population carrying capacity and an over estimate of land consumption because modern developments usually achieve higher lot yields for a given area than older developments.

The second alternative calculated growth capacity based upon multiplying the inventory of lots and the number of proposed lots by an assumed occupancy rate of 3.0 persons per lot. It is recognized that this occupancy factor will vary from community to community and that the potential number of dwellings will tend to be underestimated given that some parcels will be developed with multiple dwellings.

The next step was to estimate how long such capacity might last given a variety of assumptions on the rate of growth of the communities. It was decided to set three alternative scenarios: rapid growth; average growth; and slow growth.

These scenarios were developed for each community based upon their growth experience since 1976. The growth in the period 1976-1982 was taken as typical of rapid growth, the growth in the period 1982-1985 as typical of slow growth, and the growth over the whole period from 1976 to 1985 was taken to represent a long term average rate of growth.

In Volume 2, Table 3.1 provides the information used to calculate the residential densities for each municipality. Table 3.2 presents the calculated residential carrying capacity of both serviced lots and areas under active development. Table 3.3 presents the number of years of growth capacity for each municipality using a range of growth rates comparable to actual experience in the period 1976 - 1985.

Observations on the Intensity of Residential Land Use

Tabular References to Volume 2

Table 3.1 Estimated Density of Land Designated for Residential Use

Table 3.1.1	(ordered by municipal name)
Table 3.1.2	(ordered by density of occupied areas)
Table 3.1.3	(ordered by population of the municipality)

These tables present information on population, zoned residential land, vacant land and the calculated densities of existing residential development. Examination of the information in these tables indicates that there are some evident anomalies in the land area data.

Given that it is highly unlikely that developed densities in small towns will ever exceed 20 persons per gross acre, it should be recognized that problems with the data received probably exist where this occurs. Notably, the data from Bowden, Hanna and Fort Assiniboine led to the calculation of very high densities on developed land. It is suspected that this has resulted from urban reserve land being indicated as "under development" when in fact this is not the case. The effect of this error is lead to the subtraction of too much land from the total zoned residential land when calculating the "occupied density" resulting in an overestimation of the developed density.

The reverse situation may also be true. Communities where a very low density is calculated may have underestimated the amount of vacant land and areas zoned for future growth within their boundaries. This may well be the case where densities of less than 6 persons per gross acre are calculated. Very low densities were calculated in Breton, Warburg, Onoway, Vauxhall, Nampa, Lomond, Athabasca, Bruderheim, Plamondon, Thorsby, Irvine and Alix.

Observations on Population Carrying Capacities of Residential Land Inventories

Tabular References to Volume 2

Table 3.2 Residential Carrying Capacity of Vacant and Developing Lots at Existing Density

Table 3.2.1	(ordered by municipal name)
Table 3.2.2	(ordered by total calculated capacity)
Table 3.2.3	(ordered by capacity expressed as a percentage of existing population)

A number of observations can be made concerning these tables. Firstly, the absolute numbers calculated as population capacity appear to be relatively low for most municipalities. Excluding Hanna, Bowden and Fort Assiniboine (where density figures were particularly suspect) the calculated level of population growth capacity was not high. This approach to calculating capacity indicated that most communities can accommodate fewer than 1,000 new residents (at existing calculated densities) on presently zoned vacant and developing land.

The calculated capacity was expressed as a percentage of the existing population. This can provide an overall picture of the magnitude of growth which would be needed to use the land presently in inventory or under development. If varying growth rates are assumed, the number of years of capacity can be calculated. For example, if a 5% growth rate is projected and the municipality has capacity for accommodating an increase of 50% of existing population the present residential land inventory should be adequate for 8 to 10 years.

Observations on Municipal Residential Growth Capacity

Tabular References to Volume 2

Table 3.3 Residential Carrying Capacity of Vacant and Developing Lots Based Upon Occupancy of 3.0 Persons per Lot

Table 3.3.1	(ordered by municipal name)
Table 3.3.2	(ordered by total calculated capacity)
Table 3.3.3	(ordered by capacity expressed as a percentage of existing population)

These tables, based upon vacant and proposed lot inventories, apparently provide a more reliable estimate of the growth capacity of the municipalities than did the series based upon land area.

The reader may use these tables to compare the capacity immediately available in serviced vacant lots to the capacity which is in the process of development. The number of lots in the process of development exceeded the inventory of available serviced lots in only 17 municipalities. The significance of this lies in the fact that existing lots will likely be marketed prior to the completion of the projects still under development. Given the short term outlook for provincial growth and the impact of slow growth on the municipalities it is probable that most of the projects in the development process will lapse prior to completion. There is risk that the municipality may receive privately initiated projects in tax recovery actions. The total number of vacant serviced lots is 7,398 compared to 2,974 lots under development.

Again, the growth capacity associated with the lot inventory was expressed as a percentage of the existing population. The distribution of percentages is more even than what was produced using the density calculations. The extreme highs and lows in estimated capacity are no longer evident and this suggests that this approach to capacity measurement is more reliable.

Communities with significant excess capacity in lot inventories calculated using this approach include Irvine, Fort Assiniboine, Clyde, Lomond, Plamondon, Hythe, Strathmore and Foremost. All have lots or proposed developments which can accommodate more than 50% of their present population. Perhaps equally interesting is that 13 communities can only accommodate growth of less than 10% on new lots.

Observations Concerning the Absorption Rate of Residential Land and Lots Inventories.

Tabular References to Volume 2

Table 3.4 Residential Land Absorption at AVERAGE Growth Rates Calculated Using Area Times Density and Lots Times Occupancy

Table 3.4.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 3.4.2 (ordered by years of growth capacity calculated using lot occupancy method)

Table 3.5 Residential Land Absorption at FAST Growth Rates Calculated Using Area Times Density and Lots Times Occupancy

Table 3.5.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 3.5.2 (ordered by years of growth capacity calculated using lot occupancy method)

Table 3.6 Residential Land Absorption at SLOW Growth Rates Calculated Using Area Times Density and Lots Times Occupancy

Table 3.6.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 3.6.2 (ordered by years of growth capacity calculated using lot occupancy method)

The consideration of the series of tables on rates of residential land absorption bring forth a number of pertinent conclusions.

Firstly, when considering the lots available and the lots under development, 22 of the municipalities studied have less than a five year inventory if growth was occurring at the average rate experienced over the last nine years. All things being equal, this likely would have been considered to be a prudent inventory. Even though they may have undertaken some careful consideration of the level of inventory prior to making commitments to development, these municipalities apparently have been caught by the economic slowdown.

Another 19 communities have a 5 to 10 year inventory and 16 have a 10 to 20 year inventory of existing and proposed lots. These communities, particularly at the 10 to 20 year inventory level, would likely be judged to have excess capacity even in periods of rapid growth. Fourteen municipalities have inventories able to supply their historic rates of development for more than 20 years. These communities include Lomond, Fort Assiniboine, Vulcan, Smoky Lake, Fort Macleod, Thorhild, Plamondon, Irvine, Foremost, Thorsby, Rockyford, Athabasca, Two Hills and Clyde. Unless there are major new economic developments which spur greatly increased local growth rates for these communities it is probable that long term carrying costs will render much of this inventory unmarketable either for a profit or at cost.

Much the same observations can probably be made for all the municipalities holding inventories which would last in excess of ten years at average rates of growth. Of the communities with more than 10 years of inventory of residential lots, Vulcan, Fort Macleod, Irvine, Foremost, Rockyford, Athabasca, Two Hills, Hythe, Alix, Breton, Standard and Mannville all have significant municipal ownership of serviced lots. These communities may be in the most immediate risk in a depressed market.

The provincial ownership of lots in Fort Assiniboine, Irvine, Athabasca, Clyde, Grande Cache, Bashaw, Hythe, Swan Hills and Fox Creek is significant. Depending upon the nature of the agreements between the province and the municipalities, this could result in these communities having to accept responsibility for the associated debt.

As might be expected, there appears to be an inverse relationship between the size of the community and the potential time it may take to absorb the lot inventories. Even a few lots in a small village may take many years to absorb into the market. What is of great concern is that many of these small communities have many lots in inventory and that a substantial share of the total inventory is often owned, developed and/or financed by the public sector.

An examination of the potential for absorbing the residential lot inventories if a rapid trend of growth was re-established shows that 16 communities would still have more than 10 years of inventory. In some cases this is because they did not grow rapidly during the last period of rapid growth (1976-1982). Indeed, 2 communities experienced no growth or negative growth during this period. It reasonably might be questioned why they would grow more rapidly in future rapid growth periods. All of the communities which have more than 10 years inventory during periods of rapid growth were among those identified previously as having more than 10 years capacity under average rates of growth.

The recent period of slow growth has resulted in no growth or the decrease in population in 38 of the 73 municipalities studied. If there is no growth the lot absorption is likely to be close to zero and there will be no opportunity to sell the inventory. Of the communities which have experienced any growth during the period 1982-1985, 15 have continued to grow at a rate which would, if continued, result in their inventories being absorbed within 10 years.

An overall observation would be that, if growth continues at its recent rate, nearly all the communities studied are facing significant excess inventories of residential lots. If these lots are in municipal ownership, or are subject to financial agreements which involve the municipality, it is doubtful that sales will be able to recover costs.

Observations on Commercial and Industrial Growth Potential

Table 3.7 Vacant Commercial and Industrial Land as a Percentage of Area Designated

Table 3.7.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 3.7.2 (ordered by vacant commercial land percentage)
Table 3.7.3 (ordered by vacant industrial land percentage)

The previous section examined residential growth potential in terms of the inventory of land in the development process, the existing density of residential development and alternative rates of growth based upon the individual municipalities actual rates of growth since 1976. Comparable information on the consumption of land for industrial and commercial land uses is not available.

Building permit data is not of use since it only provides information on the value and total number of industrial and commercial permits issued each year. There is no available information as to whether these permits are for new construction or for renovations. No data is published on the amount of land used for commercial and industrial projects. Further, with commercial and industrial developments it is common to purchase additional land to allow for long term expansion of the facility. Consequently, land which appear to be vacant may in fact be alienated from the marketable inventory although they may appear on assessment records as vacant.

Table 3.7 shows the area of the commercial and industrial vacant land inventories as a percentage of the land zoned for those uses. Assuming that the same intensity of development for commercial or industrial land use is sustained in future development of the sites, the percentages provide an indication of the additional overall growth which could be accommodated on the vacant or developing land. If, for example, a municipality has 20% of its designated commercial land vacant, it may be assumed that these lands could accommodate the commercial development associated with a 20% growth in population if there is no change in the density of commercial land uses developed and that there is no significant change in the commercial function of the community.

This table should be used with some caution since it is based upon the data on the areas of vacant commercial and industrial land. It has been noted that the reliability of the land area data from the municipalities is suspect in a number of cases.

CHAPTER 4

MUNICIPAL SERVICING INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITIES

The study collected data on the capacities of a range of services to land including water treatment and water trunk capacities, sewer treatment and sewer trunk capacities and storm water management systems. The source of the data used was the questionnaires provided by the municipal administrators. Data on the capacity of the major water and sewer systems for many of the municipalities studied was also obtained from Alberta Environment and could be used to compare to the data obtained from the municipality. To date, these comparisons have not been made.

The tables in Volume 2 compare the capacities indicated for the specific systems to the existing and potential residential growth for each community. Potential residential growth is calculated from the number of vacant and proposed residential lots multiplied by an occupancy factor of 3.0 persons per lot. The "remaining capacity" is calculated by subtracting the existing and potential population from the total system capacity. It should be recognized that this approach makes no allowance for the servicing needs associated with the commercial and industrial development which is likely to occur in association with residential growth. Thus, the "remaining capacity" should not be considered as true "excess capacity" but rather as a comparative measure of ability to accommodate future growth with the existing infrastructure system. For example, if the residential growth in a community results in little or no remaining capacity it is probable that additional capacity will have to be constructed before the residential growth is completed in order to accommodate commercial and industrial developments.

In considering the capacity of services it is equally a problem to have too little or too much capacity. If the community has too little capacity it will be forced to make significant investments in infrastructure prior to bringing lot inventories onto the market. If the community has too much capacity, the local taxpayer will be faced with having to sustain the extra capital and operating costs associated with the unused services. The impact on local taxes and utility costs could conceivably retard growth, particularly if other nearby communities have lower utility charges and taxes.

Observations on Water Supply and Water Trunk Systems Capacity

Tabular References to Volume 2

Table 4.1 Water Supply System Capacity Analysis

Table 4.1.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 4.1.2 (ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied.)

Table 4.2 Water Trunk System Capacity Analysis

Table 4.2.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 4.2.2 (ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied.)

Most of the communities studied appear to have adequate water supply and distribution systems capacity to accommodate the growth associated with present and developing residential lot inventories. A number of communities are served by regional water systems and thus supply is not a constraint to their growth. In these cases the data on capacity was occasionally indicated as 0 (Vegreville, Stony Plain, Gibbons) and sometimes related to the potential capacity of the regional water line (Morinville, Bruderheim).

Edson, Two Hills, Rimbey, Irvine, Foremost, Boyle, Hythe and Nobleford all indicated that the capacity of their water supply systems may not be capable of accommodating the population growth associated with their present or proposed residential lots inventories. The same observations concerning the municipal water distribution systems for are made concerning Olds, Edson, Hythe, Two Hills, Strathmore, Brooks, Swan Hills, Foremost, Nampa and Fort Macleod. It should be recognized that the water distribution systems are often installed as part of the land development process and capacity will tie directly to the marketable inventories of lots.

Overall it could be said that most of the municipalities have considerable capacity built into their existing water systems to accommodate future residential growth. The systems are indicated as having capacity to serve up to 305,570 people. The existing population plus the potential population carrying capacity of vacant and proposed lots comes to 194,734.

Observations on Sewage Treatment and Sewer Trunk Systems Capacity

Tabular References to Volume 2

Table 4.3 Sewage Treatment System Capacity Analysis

Table 4.3.1	(ordered by municipal name)
Table 4.3.2	(ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied.)

Table 4.4 Sewer Trunk System Capacity Analysis

Table 4.4.1	(ordered by municipal name)
Table 4.4.2	(ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied.)

Most of the communities appear to have adequate or excess sewage system capacity to accommodate anticipated residential growth. The identified exceptions to this include Strathmore, Two Hills, Beiseker, Didsbury and Cayley.

Municipalities which may have shortages of sewer trunk capacity, if vacant and proposed lots develop, include Two Hills, Strathmore, Hythe, Beiseker, Swan Hills, Thorhild, Foremost, Nampa, Fort Macleod and Cayley. Beiseker indicated that its existing sewage capacity is less than the present population.

Total indicated sewage treatment capacity is for a population of 270,670 and the total potential population associated with the development of vacant and proposed lots plus existing population is 167,014.

Observations on Storm Water Management Systems Capacity

Tabular References to Volume 2

Table 4.5 Storm Water Management System Capacity Analysis

Table 4.5.1	(ordered by municipal name)
Table 4.5.2	(ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied.)

Only 41 of the 73 communities indicated that they had storm water management capacity. Most of these communities were the larger ones in the study group. A possible implication is that if the smaller communities grow, it is likely that storm water management will become a higher municipal priority. The impact on municipal finance is indeterminate since most new subdivisions will include storm water management as part of the initial design and servicing costs incorporated into the lot price. However, a major hidden problem in many of the communities that do not presently have storm water management systems may be costs associated with storm water infiltration into the sanitary sewer system which effectively eliminates much of the capacity of that service. The public costs involved in retroactively separating storm water from sanitary sewage trunks and treatment are often a major investment.

Table 4.5.2 in Volume 2 lists the municipalities in increasing order of storm water management capacity. Of the 41 municipalities that did indicate storm water management capacities, only Lac La Biche, Fairview, Strathmore, Brooks, Swan Hills and Nampa have identified existing capacities smaller than the potential growth associated with the development of their inventories of vacant and proposed lots.

APPENDIX I

MUNICIPALITIES SURVEYED

ACME *	VILLAGE	INNISFAIL	TOWN
AIRDRIE *	CITY	IRVINE	TOWN
ALIX	VILLAGE	LAC LA BICHE	TOWN
ATHABASCA	TOWN	LACOMBE	TOWN
BARNWELL	VILLAGE	LAMONT *	TOWN
BARRHEAD	TOWN	LINDEN	TOWN
BASHAW	TOWN	LOMOND **	TOWN
BEISEKER	VILLAGE	MANNING	TOWN
BOWDEN	TOWN	MANNVILLE	VILLAGE
BOYLE **	VILLAGE	MAYERTHORPE	TOWN
BRETON	VILLAGE	MORINVILLE	TOWN
BROOKS **	TOWN	MYRNAM *	VILLAGE
BRUDERHEIM	TOWN	NAMPA	VILLAGE
CALMAR **	TOWN	NOBLEFORD	VILLAGE
CANMORE	TOWN	OLDS	TOWN
CARSTAIRS	TOWN	ONOWAY	VILLAGE
CAYLEY	VILLAGE	PENHOLD	TOWN
CLYDE	VILLAGE	PICTURE BUTTE	TOWN
CORONATION	TOWN	PLAMONDON **	VILLAGE
COUTTS	VILLAGE	REDCLIFF **	TOWN
CROWSNEST PASS *	TOWN	REDWATER	TOWN
DEVON	TOWN	RIMBEY	TOWN
DIDSBURY	TOWN	ROCKYFORD	VILLAGE
DRAYTON VALLEY	TOWN	SMOKY LAKE	TOWN
ECKVILLE	TOWN	ST. PAUL	TOWN
EDSON	TOWN	STANDARD	VILLAGE
ELK POINT *	TOWN	STETTLER	TOWN
FAIRVIEW	TOWN	STONY PLAIN	TOWN
FOREMOST	VILLAGE	STRATHMORE	TOWN
FT. ASSINIBOINE	TOWN	SWAN HILLS	TOWN
FORT MACLEOD **	TOWN	THORHILD **	VILLAGE
FOX CREEK	TOWN	THORSBY	VILLAGE
GIBBONS	TOWN	TURNER VALLEY	TOWN
GRAND CENTRE*	TOWN	TWO HILLS	TOWN
GRANDE CACHE	TOWN	VALLEYVIEW	TOWN
GRANUM	TOWN	VAUXHALL	TOWN
HANNA	TOWN	VEGREVILLE	TOWN
HIGH LEVEL	TOWN	VULCAN	TOWN
HIGH PRAIRIE	TOWN	WARBURG	VILLAGE
HIGH RIVER	TOWN	WHITECOURT	TOWN
HYTHE	VILLAGE		

* Dropped from analysis or no response.
** Questionnaire completed using staff field work.

AN INVENTORY OF LAND, LOTS AND SERVICING CAPACITY FOR SELECTED ALBERTA MUNICIPALITIES

VOLUME 2 TABLES

Alberta Municipal Affairs
Planning Services Division
Research and Development Branch

May 1987

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 2
TABLES

TABLE 1.1 INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED RESIDENTIAL LOTS

Table 1.1.1	By Ownership (ordered by municipal name)
Table 1.1.2	By Ownership (ordered by acreage of vacant serviced land)
Table 1.1.3	By Ownership (ordered by number of serviced lots)
Table 1.1.4	By Vacant Residential Lots per Capita (ordered by municipal name)
Table 1.1.5	By Vacant Residential Lots per Capita (ordered by lots per capita)

TABLE 1.2 INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED COMMERCIAL LOTS

Table 1.2.1	By Ownership (ordered by municipal name)
Table 1.2.2	By Ownership (ordered by acreage of vacant serviced land)
Table 1.2.3	By Ownership (ordered by number of serviced lots)
Table 1.2.4	By Vacant Commercial Lots per Capita (ordered by municipal name)
Table 1.2.5	By Vacant Commercial Lots per Capita (ordered by lots per capita)

TABLE 1.3 INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED INDUSTRIAL LOTS

Table 1.3.1	By Ownership (ordered by municipal name)
Table 1.3.2	By Ownership (ordered by acreage of vacant serviced land)
Table 1.3.3	By Ownership (ordered by number of serviced lots)
Table 1.3.4	By Vacant Industrial lots per Capita (ordered by municipal name)
Table 1.3.5	By Vacant Industrial Lots per Capita (ordered by lots per capita)

TABLE 1.4 INVENTORY OF VACANT MISCELLANEOUS LOTS

By Ownership (Tabulated only for municipalities indicating lot inventories in this category)

Tables (continued) ....

TABLE 2.1 RESIDENTIAL LAND AND LOTS IN PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT

Table 2.1.1 By Ownership (ordered by municipal name)
Table 2.1.2 By Ownership (ordered by acreage of land proposed for residential development)
Table 2.1.3 By Ownership (ordered by number of proposed residential lots)

TABLE 2.2 COMMERCIAL LAND AND LOTS IN PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT

Table 2.2.1 By Ownership (ordered by municipal name)
Table 2.2.2 By Ownership (ordered by acreage of land proposed for commercial development)
Table 2.2.3 By Ownership (order by number of proposed commercial lots)

TABLE 2.3 INDUSTRIAL LAND AND LOTS IN PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT

Table 2.3.1 By Ownership (ordered by municipal name)
Table 2.3.2 By Ownership (ordered by acreage of land proposed for industrial development)
Table 2.3.3 By Ownership (ordered by number of proposed industrial lots)

TABLE 3.1 ESTIMATED DENSITY OF LAND DESIGNATED FOR RESIDENTIAL USE

Table 3.1.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 3.1.2 (ordered by density of occupied areas)
Table 3.1.3 (ordered by population of the municipality)

TABLE 3.2 RESIDENTIAL CAPACITY OF VACANT AND DEVELOPING LOTS AT EXISTING DENSITY

Table 3.2.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 3.2.2 (ordered by total calculated capacity)
Table 3.2.3 (ordered by capacity expressed as a percentage of existing population)

Tables (continued) ....

TABLE 3.3 RESIDENTIAL CAPACITY OF VACANT AND DEVELOPING LOTS BASED UPON OCCUPANCY OF 3.0 PERSONS PER LOT

Table 3.3.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 3.3.2 (ordered by total calculated capacity)
Table 3.3.3 (ordered by capacity expressed as a percentage of existing population)

TABLE 3.4 RESIDENTIAL LAND ABSORPTION AT AVERAGE GROWTH RATES CALCULATED USING AREA TIMES DENSITY AND LOTS TIMES OCCUPANCY

Table 3.4.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 3.4.2 (ordered by years of growth capacity calculated using lot occupancy method)

TABLE 3.5 RESIDENTIAL LAND ABSORPTION AT RAPID GROWTH RATES CALCULATED USING AREA TIMES DENSITY AND LOTS TIMES OCCUPANCY

Table 3.5.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 3.5.2 (ordered by years of growth capacity calculated using lot occupancy method)

TABLE 3.6 RESIDENTIAL LAND ABSORPTION AT SLOW GROWTH RATES CALCULATED USING AREA TIMES DENSITY AND LOTS TIMES OCCUPANCY

Table 3.6.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 3.6.2 (ordered by years of growth capacity calculated using lot occupancy method)

TABLE 3.7 VACANT COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL LAND AS A PERCENTAGE OF AREA DESIGNATED

Table 3.7.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 3.7.2 (ordered by vacant commercial land percentage)
Table 3.7.3 (ordered by vacant industrial land percentage)

Tables (continued)

TABLE 4.1 WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS

Table 4.1.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 4.1.2 (ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied)

TABLE 4.2 WATER TRUNK SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS

Table 4.2.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 4.2.2 (ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied)

TABLE 4.3 SEWAGE TREATMENT SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS

Table 4.3.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 4.3.2 (ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied)

TABLE 4.4 SEWER TRUNK SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS

Table 4.4.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 4.4.2 (ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied)

TABLE 4.5 STORM WATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS

Table 4.5.1 (ordered by municipal name)
Table 4.5.2 (ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied)

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED RESIDENTIAL LOTS
By Ownership
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	Area (Ac)	Ownership of Lots: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
ALIX	11.6	5	55	0	60
ATHABASCA	45.3	65	5	102	172
BARNWELL	5.1	8	9	0	17
BARRHEAD	18.0	76	0	52	128
BASHAW	16.4	0	0	63	63
BEISEKER	0.0	16	4	41	61
BOWDEN	13.4	29	53	6	88
BOYLE	4.7	13	10	0	23
BRETON	4.8	3	22	0	25
BROOKS	36.2	69	0	0	69
BRUDERHEIM	8.7	37	0	0	37
CALMAR	26.4	101	0	0	101
CANMORE	64.0	291	2	260	553
CARSTAIRS	0.0	17	4	0	21
CAYLEY	0.0	4	0	0	4
CLYDE	13.8	72	1	20	93
CORONATION	.7	2	3	0	5
COUTTS	2.6	16	3	0	19
DEVON	6.2	45	0	7	52
DIDSBURY	0.0	96	29	0	125
DRAYTON VALLEY	40.7	66	39	0	105
ECKVILLE	6.0	0	22	0	22
EDSON	34.1	95	40	8	143
FAIRVIEW	63.4	165	0	49	214
FOREMOST	4.9	6	22	0	28
FORT ASSINIBOINE	19.0	47	0	24	71
FORT MACLEOD	17.8	52	39	0	91
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	8	172	180
GIBBONS	0.0	159	0	35	194
GRANDE CACHE	81.5	9	0	180	189
GRANUM	3.7	9	14	0	23
HANNA	8.3	11	0	44	55
HIGH LEVEL	17.8	1	0	116	117
HIGH PRAIRIE	16.2	19	1	46	66
HIGH RIVER	9.9	0	50	0	50
HYTHE	16.6	25	43	49	117
INNISFAIL	17.0	53	40	6	99
IRVINE	10.4	14	9	40	63
LAC LA BICHE	14.2	8	0	45	53
LACOMBE	0.0	119	2	90	211
LINDEN	7.5	1	16	32	49
LOMOND	2.0	10	0	0	10
MANNING	10.4	22	3	29	54
MANNVILLE	16.0	28	33	0	61
MAYERTHORPE	10.7	2	61	0	63
MORINVILLE	58.2	237	21	0	258
NAMPA	10.0	53	1	0	54
NOBLEFORD	3.1	3	14	0	17
OLDS	70.0	231	91	4	326
ONOWAY	0.0	87	0	0	87
PENHOLD	1.3	2	1	4	7
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	20	4	0	24
PLAMONDON	3.2	10	0	0	10
REDCLIFF	19.3	102	0	0	102
REDWATER	21.0	87	0	0	87
RIMBEY	29.9	143	4	0	147
ROCKYFORD	0.0	3	14	0	17
SMOKY LAKE	20.8	84	0	0	84
ST. PAUL	0.0	49	4	0	53
STANDARD	5.0	10	20	0	30
STETTLER	24.8	23	52	42	117
STONY PLAIN	37.0	213	0	0	213
STRATHMORE	50.7	368	0	0	368
SWAN HILLS	7.7	0	0	15	15
THORHILD	9.7	47	0	0	47
THORSBY	0.0	96	0	0	96
TURNER VALLEY	10.8	31	0	33	64
TWO HILLS	25.3	11	70	0	81
VAUXHALL	22.1	35	16	2	53
VEGREVILLE	69.2	320	10	20	350
VULCAN	24.4	14	95	0	109
WARBURG	25.0	91	1	0	92
WHITECOURT	52.7	40	128	78	246
TOTALS	1,307.2	4,496	1,188	1,714	7,398
%		61	16	23	100

TABLE 1.1.2

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED RESIDENTIAL LOTS
By Ownership
(ordered by acreage of vacant serviced land)

Municipality	Area (Ac)	Ownership of Lots: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
BEISEKER	0.0	16	4	41	61
CARSTAIRS	0.0	17	4	0	21
CAYLEY	0.0	4	0	0	4
DIDSBURY	0.0	96	29	0	125
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	8	172	180
GIBBONS	0.0	159	0	35	194
LACOMBE	0.0	119	2	90	211
ONOWAY	0.0	87	0	0	87
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	20	4	0	24
ROCKYFORD	0.0	3	14	0	17
ST. PAUL	0.0	49	4	0	53
THORSBY	0.0	96	0	0	96
CORONATION	.7	2	3	0	5
PENHOLD	1.3	2	1	4	7
LOMOND	2.0	10	0	0	10
COUTTS	2.6	16	3	0	19
NOBLEFORD	3.1	3	14	0	17
PLAMONDON	3.2	10	0	0	10
GRANUM	3.7	9	14	0	23
BOYLE	4.7	13	10	0	23
BRETON	4.8	3	22	0	25
FOREMOST	4.9	6	22	0	28
STANDARD	5.0	10	20	0	30
BARNWELL	5.1	8	9	0	17
ECKVILLE	6.0	0	22	0	22
DEVON	6.2	45	0	7	52
LINDEN	7.5	1	16	32	49
SWAN HILLS	7.7	0	0	15	15
HANNA	8.3	11	0	44	55
BRUDERHEIM	8.7	37	0	0	37
THORHILD	9.7	47	0	0	47
HIGH RIVER	9.9	0	50	0	50
NAMPA	10.0	53	1	0	54
IRVINE	10.4	14	9	40	63
MANNING	10.4	22	3	29	54
MAYERTHORPE	10.7	2	61	0	63
TURNER VALLEY	10.8	31	0	33	64
ALIX	11.6	5	55	0	60
BOWDEN	13.4	29	53	6	88
CLYDE	13.8	72	1	20	93
LAC LA BICHE	14.2	8	0	45	53
MANNVILLE	16.0	28	33	0	61
HIGH PRAIRIE	16.2	19	1	46	66
BASHAW	16.4	0	0	63	63
HYTHE	16.6	25	43	49	117
INNISFAIL	17.0	53	40	6	99
FORT MACLEOD	17.8	52	39	0	91
HIGH LEVEL	17.8	1	0	116	117
BARRHEAD	18.0	76	0	52	128
FORT ASSINIBOINE	19.0	47	0	24	71
REDCLIFF	19.3	102	0	0	102
SMOKY LAKE	20.8	84	0	0	84
REDWATER	21.0	87	0	0	87
VAUXHALL	22.1	35	16	2	53
VULCAN	24.4	14	95	0	109
STETTLER	24.8	23	52	42	117
WARBURG	25.0	91	1	0	92
TWO HILLS	25.3	11	70	0	81
CALMAR	26.4	101	0	0	101
RIMBEY	29.9	143	4	0	147
EDSON	34.1	95	40	8	143
BROOKS	36.2	69	0	0	69
STONY PLAIN	37.0	213	0	0	213
DRAYTON VALLEY	40.7	66	39	0	105
ATHABASCA	45.3	65	5	102	172
STRATHMORE	50.7	368	0	0	368
WHITECOURT	52.7	40	128	78	246
MORINVILLE	58.2	237	21	0	258
FAIRVIEW	63.4	165	0	49	214
CANMORE	64.0	291	2	260	553
VEGREVILLE	69.2	520	10	20	550
OLDS	70.0	231	91	4	326
GRANDE CACHE	81.5	9	0	180	189
TOTALS	1,307.2	4,496	1,188	1,714	7,398
%		61	16	23	100

TABLE 1.1.3

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED RESIDENTIAL LOTS
By Ownership
(ordered by number of serviced lots)

Municipality	Area (Ac)	Ownership of Lots: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
CAYLEY	0.0	4	0	0	4
CORONATION	-	2	3	0	5
PENHOLD	1.3	2	1	4	7
LOMOND	2.0	10	0	0	10
PLAMONDON	3.2	10	0	0	10
SWAN HILLS	7.7	0	0	15	15
BARNWELL	5.1	8	9	0	17
NOBLEFORD	3.1	3	14	0	17
ROCKYFORD	0.0	3	14	0	17
COUTTS	2.6	16	3	0	19
CARSTAIRS	0.0	17	4	0	21
ECKVILLE	6.0	0	22	0	22
BOYLE	4.7	13	10	0	23
GRANUM	3.7	9	14	0	23
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	20	4	0	24
BRETON	4.8	3	22	0	25
FOREMOST	4.9	6	22	0	28
STANDARD	5.0	10	20	0	30
BRUDERHEIM	8.7	37	0	0	37
THORHILD	9.7	47	0	0	47
LINDEN	7.5	1	16	32	49
HIGH RIVER	9.9	0	50	0	50
DEVON	6.2	45	0	7	52
LAC LA BICHE	14.2	8	0	45	53
ST. PAUL	0.0	49	4	0	53
VAUXHALL	22.1	35	16	2	53
MANNING	10.4	22	3	29	54
NAMPA	10.0	53	1	0	54
HANNA	8.3	11	0	44	55
ALIX	11.6	5	55	0	60
BEISEKER	0.0	16	4	41	61
MANNVILLE	16.0	28	33	0	61
BASHAW	16.4	0	0	63	63
IRVINE	10.4	14	9	40	63
MAYERTHORPE	10.7	2	61	0	63
TURNER VALLEY	10.8	31	0	33	64
HIGH PRAIRIE	16.2	19	1	46	66
BROOKS	36.2	69	0	0	69
FORT ASSINIBOINE	19.0	47	0	24	71
TWO HILLS	25.3	11	70	0	81
SMOKY LAKE	20.8	84	0	0	84
ONOWAY	0.0	87	0	0	87
REDWATER	21.0	87	0	0	87
BOWDEN	13.4	29	53	6	88
FORT MACLEOD	17.8	52	39	0	91
WARBURG	25.0	91	1	0	92
CLYDE	13.8	72	1	20	93
THORSBY	0.0	96	0	0	96
INNISFAIL	17.0	53	40	6	99
CALMAR	26.4	101	0	0	101
REDCLIFF	19.3	102	0	0	102
DRAYTON VALLEY	40.7	66	39	0	105
VULCAN	24.4	14	95	0	109
HIGH LEVEL	17.8	1	0	116	117
HYTHE	16.6	25	43	49	117
STETTLER	24.8	23	52	42	117
DIDSBURY	0.0	96	29	0	125
BARRHEAD	18.0	76	0	52	128
EDSON	34.1	95	40	8	143
RIMBEY	29.9	143	4	0	147
ATHABASCA	45.3	65	5	102	172
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	8	172	180
GRANDE CACHE	81.5	9	0	180	189
GIBBONS	0.0	159	0	35	194
LACOMBE	0.0	119	2	90	211
STONY PLAIN	37.0	213	0	0	213
FAIRVIEW	63.4	165	0	49	214
WHITECOURT	52.7	40	128	78	246
MORINVILLE	58.2	237	21	0	258
OLDS	70.0	231	91	4	326
STRATHMORE	50.7	368	0	0	368
VEGREVILLE	69.2	520	10	20	550
CANMORE	64.0	291	2	260	553
TOTALS	1,307.2	4,496	1,188	1,714	7,398
%		61	16	23	100

TABLE 1.1.4

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED RESIDENTIAL LOTS
By Vacant Residential Lots per Capita
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Vacant Residential: Lots (1986)	Area (1986)	Lots Per Capita
ALIX	837	60	11.6	.0717
ATHABASCA	1,933	172	45.3	.0890
BARNWELL	373	17	5.1	.0456
BARRHEAD	3,849	138	18.0	.0358
BASHAW	875	63	16.4	.0720
BEISEKER	648	61	0.0	.0941
BOWDEN	983	88	13.4	.0895
BOYLE	703	23	4.7	.0327
BRETON	534	25	4.8	.0468
BROOKS	9,421	69	36.2	.0073
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	37	8.7	.0299
CALMAR	1,137	101	26.4	.0888
CANMORE	4,012	553	64.0	.1378
CARSTAIRS	1,723	21	0.0	.0122
CAYLEY	232	4	0.0	.0172
CLYDE	406	93	13.8	.2291
CORONATION	1,268	5	.7	.0039
COUTTS	400	19	2.6	.0475
DEVON	3,931	52	6.2	.0132
DIDSBURY	3,219	125	0.0	.0388
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	105	40.7	.0211
ECKVILLE	842	22	6.0	.0261
EDSON	7,110	143	34.1	.0201
FAIRVIEW	3,234	214	63.4	.0662
FOREMOST	617	28	4.9	.0454
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	91	17.8	.0290
FOX CREEK	1,978	180	0.0	.0910
GIBBONS	2,620	194	0.0	.0740
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	189	81.5	.0409
GRANUM	399	23	3.7	.0576
HANNA	3,036	55	8.3	.0181
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	117	17.8	.0410
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	66	16.2	.0256
HIGH RIVER	5,114	50	9.9	.0098
HYTHE	681	117	16.6	.1718
INNISFAIL	5,435	99	17.0	.0182
IRVINE	360	63	10.4	.1750
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	53	14.2	.0236
LACOMBE	5,954	211	0.0	.0354
LINDEN	461	49	7.5	.1063
LOMOND	204	10	2.0	.0490
MANNING	1,262	54	10.4	.0428
MANNVILLE	799	61	16.0	.0763
MAYERTHORPE	1,475	63	10.7	.0427
MORINVILLE	5,273	258	58.2	.0489
NAMPA	435	54	10.0	.1241
NOBLEFORD	547	17	3.1	.0311
OLDS	4,932	326	70.0	.0661
ONOWAY	669	87	0.0	.1300
PENHOLD	1,588	7	1.3	.0044
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	24	0.0	.0154
PLAMONDON	271	10	3.2	.0369
REDCLIFF	3,814	102	19.3	.0267
REDWATER	2,197	87	21.0	.0396
RIMBEY	1,906	147	29.9	.0771
ROCKYFORD	292	17	0.0	.0582
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	84	20.8	.0721
ST. PAUL	5,052	54	0.0	.0107
STANDARD	379	30	5.0	.0792
STETTLER	5,136	117	24.8	.0228
STONY PLAIN	5,291	213	37.0	.0402
STRATHMORE	3,530	368	50.7	.1042
SWAN HILLS	2,497	15	7.7	.0060
THORHILD	566	47	9.7	.0830
THORSBY	737	96	0.0	.1302
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	64	10.8	.0493
TWO HILLS	1,330	81	25.3	.0609
VAUXHALL	492	53	22.1	.1077
VEGREVILLE	5,251	550	69.2	.1047
VULCAN	1,507	109	24.4	.0723
WARBURG	552	92	25.0	.1667
WHITECOURT	5,408	246	52.7	.0455
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	71	19.0	.3318
TOTALS	163,615	7,409	1,307.2	.0638 (Avg.)

TABLE 1.1.5

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED RESIDENTIAL LOTS
By Vacant Residential Lots per Capita
(ordered by lots per capita)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Vacant Residential: Lots (1986)	Area (1986)	Lots Per Capita
CORONATION	1,268	5	.7	.0039
PENHOLD	1,588	7	1.3	.0044
SWAN HILLS	2,497	15	7.7	.0060
BROOKS	9,421	69	36.2	.0073
HIGH RIVER	5,114	50	9.9	.0098
ST. PAUL	5,052	54	0.0	.0107
CARSTAIRS	1,725	21	0.0	.0122
DEVON	3,931	52	6.2	.0132
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	24	0.0	.0154
CAYLEY	232	4	0.0	.0172
HANNA	3,036	55	8.3	.0181
INNISFAIL	5,435	99	17.0	.0182
EDSON	7,110	143	34.1	.0201
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	105	40.7	.0211
STETTLER	5,136	117	24.8	.0228
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	53	14.2	.0236
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	66	16.2	.0256
ECKVILLE	842	22	6.0	.0261
REDCLIFF	3,814	102	19.3	.0267
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	91	17.8	.0290
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	37	8.7	.0299
NOBLEFORD	547	17	3.1	.0311
BOYLE	703	23	4.7	.0327
LACOMBE	5,954	211	0.0	.0354
BARRHEAD	3,849	138	18.0	.0358
PLAMONDON	271	10	3.2	.0369
DIDSBURY	3,219	125	0.0	.0388
REDWATER	2,197	87	21.0	.0396
STONY PLAIN	5,291	213	37.0	.0402
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	189	81.5	.0409
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	117	17.8	.0410
MAYERTHORPE	1,475	63	10.7	.0427
MANNING	1,262	54	10.4	.0428
FOREMOST	617	28	4.9	.0454
WHITECOURT	5,408	246	52.7	.0455
BARNWELL	373	17	5.1	.0456
BRETON	534	25	4.8	.0468
COUTTS	400	19	2.6	.0475
MORINVILLE	5,273	258	58.2	.0489
LOMOND	204	10	2.0	.0490
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	64	10.8	.0493
GRANUM	399	23	3.7	.0576
ROCKYFORD	292	17	0.0	.0582
TWO HILLS	1,330	81	25.3	.0609
OLDS	4,932	326	70.0	.0661
FAIRVIEW	3,234	214	63.4	.0662
ALIX	837	60	11.6	.0717
BASHAW	875	63	16.4	.0720
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	8-	20.8	.0721
VI[illegible]	1,507	109	24.4	.0723
GIBBONS	2,620	194	0.0	.0740
HANNVILLE	799	61	16.0	.0763
RIMBEY	1,906	147	29.9	.0771
STANDARD	379	30	5.0	.0792
THORHILD	566	47	9.7	.0830
CALMAR	1,137	101	26.4	.0888
ATHABASCA	1,933	172	45.3	.0890
BOWDEN	983	88	13.4	.0895
FOX CREEK	1,978	180	0.0	.0910
BEISEKER	648	61	0.0	.0941
STRATHMORE	3,530	368	50.7	.1042
VEGREVILLE	5,251	550	69.2	.1047
LINDEN	461	49	7.5	.1063
VAUXHALL	492	53	22.1	.1077
NAMPA	435	54	10.0	.1241
ONOWAY	669	87	0.0	.1300
THORSBY	737	96	0.0	.1302
CANMORE	4,012	553	64.0	.1378
WARBURG	552	92	25.0	.1667
HYTHE	681	117	16.6	.1718
IRVINE	360	63	10.4	.1750
CLYDE	406	93	13.8	.2291
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	71	19.0	.3318
TOTALS	163,615	7,409	1,307.2	.0638 (Avg.)

TABLE 1.2.1

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED COMMERCIAL LOTS
By Ownership
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	Area (Ac)	Ownership of Lots: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
ALIX	1.5	10	6	0	16
ATHABASCA	1.8	5	7	1	13
BARNWELL	0.0	0	0	0	0
BARRHEAD	7.0	22	0	0	22
BASHAW	6.3	0	9	0	9
BEISEKER	0.0	15	0	0	15
BOWDEN	.9	9	0	0	9
BOYLE	1.6	16	0	0	16
BRETON	5.5	10	5	1	16
BROOKS	30.5	27	0	0	27
BRUDERHEIM	3.8	27	0	0	27
CALMAR	.8	2	0	0	2
CANMORE	84.0	13	0	4	17
CARSTAIRS	0.0	3	2	0	5
CAYLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
CLYDE	3.7	9	5	0	14
CORONATION	8.0	18	17	0	35
COUTTS	3.4	0	0	6	6
DEVON	14.0	6	5	0	11
DIDSBURY	0.0	18	3	0	21
DRAYTON VALLEY	21.7	12	0	0	12
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
EDSON	65.2	70	18	0	88
FAIRVIEW	23.2	41	2	0	43
FOREMOST	1.4	3	3	0	6
FORT ASSINIBOINE	1.8	5	1	0	6
FORT MACLEOD	1.6	9	0	0	9
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	30	0	30
GIBBONS	0.0	0	4	0	4
GRANDE CACHE	6.0	0	7	0	7
GRANUM	.9	7	3	0	10
HANNA	.9	6	0	0	6
HIGH LEVEL	13.0	0	0	27	27
HIGH PRAIRIE	61.4	70	2	0	72
HIGH RIVER	.1	0	1	0	1
HYTHE	9.4	30	4	0	34
INNISFAIL	25.0	14	6	0	20
IRVINE	2.3	20	12	0	32
LAC LA BICHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LACOMBE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LINDEN	3.1	4	3	0	7
LOMOND	0.0	0	0	0	0
MANNING	0.0	13	0	0	13
MANNVILLE	.7	6	0	0	6
MAYERTHORPE	24.3	6	20	0	26
MORINVILLE	19.5	48	5	0	53
NAMPA	4.0	7	0	0	7
NOBLEFORD	.5	0	8	0	8
OLDS	12.8	28	0	3	31
ONOWAY	0.0	4	0	0	4
PENHOLD	5.9	8	0	0	8
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	14	0	0	14
PLAMONDON	7.7	9	0	0	9
REDCLIFF	44.1	89	0	0	89
REDWATER	1.0	4	0	0	4
RIMBEY	6.0	24	1	0	25
ROCKYFORD	0.0	2	1	0	3
SMOKY LAKE	19.7	11	0	0	11
ST. PAUL	0.0	20	0	0	20
STANDARD	0.0	0	0	0	0
STETTLER	18.2	32	4	0	36
STONY PLAIN	38.5	0	19	0	19
STRATHMORE	14.0	5	2	0	7
SWAN HILLS	14.8	11	11	0	22
THORHILD	.7	6	0	0	6
THORSBY	0.0	9	6	0	15
TURNER VALLEY	1.2	9	0	0	9
TWO HILLS	38.0	5	25	0	30
VAUXHALL	13.3	35	6	0	41
VEGREVILLE	12.4	6	0	0	6
VULCAN	6.2	0	3	0	3
WARBURG	5.0	23	0	0	23
WHITECOURT	31.4	21	9	0	30
TOTALS	771.9	956	295	42	1,293
%		74	23	3	100

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED COMMERCIAL LOTS
By Ownership
(ordered by acreage of vacant serviced land)

Municipality	Area (Ac)	Ownership of Lots: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
BARNWELL	0.0	0	0	0	0
BEISEKER	0.0	15	0	0	15
CARSTAIRS	0.0	3	2	0	5
CAYLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
DIDSBURY	0.0	18	3	0	21
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	50	0	50
GIBBONS	0.0	0	4	0	4
LAC LA BICHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LACOMBE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LOMOND	0.0	0	0	0	0
MANNING	0.0	13	0	0	13
ONOWAY	0.0	4	0	0	4
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	14	0	0	14
ROCKYFORD	0.0	2	1	0	3
ST. PAUL	0.0	20	0	0	20
STANDARD	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORSBY	0.0	9	6	0	15
HIGH RIVER	.1	0	1	0	1
NOBLEFORD	.5	0	8	0	8
MANNVILLE	.7	6	0	0	6
THORHILD	.7	6	0	0	6
CALMAR	.8	2	0	0	2
BOWDEN	.9	9	0	0	9
GRANUM	.9	7	3	0	10
HANNA	.9	6	0	0	6
REDWATER	1.0	4	0	0	4
TURNER VALLEY	1.2	9	0	0	9
FOREMOST	1.4	3	3	0	6
ALIX	1.5	10	6	0	16
BOYLE	1.6	16	0	0	16
FORT MACLEOD	1.6	9	0	0	9
ATHABASCA	1.8	5	7	1	13
FORT ASSINIBOINE	1.8	5	1	0	6
IRVINE	2.3	20	12	0	32
LINDEN	3.1	4	3	0	7
COUTTS	3.4	0	0	6	6
CLYDE	3.7	9	5	0	14
BRUDERHEIM	3.8	27	0	0	27
NAMPA	4.0	7	0	0	7
WARBURG	5.0	23	0	0	23
BRETON	5.5	10	5	1	16
PENHOLD	5.9	8	0	0	8
GRANDE CACHE	6.0	0	7	0	7
RIMBEY	6.0	24	1	0	25
VULCAN	6.2	0	3	0	3
BASHAW	6.3	0	9	0	9
BARRHEAD	7.0	22	0	0	22
PLAMONDON	7.7	9	0	0	9
CORONATION	8.0	18	17	0	35
HYTHE	9.4	30	4	0	34
VEGREVILLE	12.4	6	0	0	6
OLDS	12.8	28	0	3	31
VAUXHALL	13.3	35	6	0	41
DEVON	14.0	6	5	0	11
STRATHMORE	14.0	5	2	0	7
SWAN HILLS	14.8	11	11	0	22
HIGH LEVEL	15.0	0	0	27	27
STETTLER	18.2	32	4	0	36
MORINVILLE	19.5	48	5	0	53
SMOKY LAKE	19.7	11	0	0	11
DRAYTON VALLEY	21.7	12	0	0	12
FAIRVIEW	23.2	41	2	0	43
MAYERTHORPE	24.5	6	20	0	26
INNISFAIL	25.0	14	6	0	20
BROOKS	30.5	27	0	0	27
TWO HILLS	38.0	5	25	0	30
STONY PLAIN	38.5	0	19	0	19
REDCLIFF	44.1	89	0	0	89
WHITECOURT	51.4	21	9	0	30
HIGH PRAIRIE	61.4	70	2	0	72
EDSON	63.2	70	18	0	88
CANMORE	84.0	13	0	4	17
TOTALS	771.9	956	295	42	1,293
%		74	23	3	100

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED COMMERCIAL LOTS
By Ownership
(ordered by number of serviced lots)

Municipality	Area (Ac)	Ownership of Lots: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
BARNWELL	0.0	0	0	0	0
CAYLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LAC LA BICHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LACOMBE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LOMOND	0.0	0	0	0	0
STANDARD	0.0	0	0	0	0
HIGH RIVER	.1	0	1	0	1
CALMAR	.8	2	0	0	2
ROCKYFORD	0.0	2	1	0	3
VULCAN	6.2	0	3	0	3
GIBBONS	0.0	0	4	0	4
ONOWAY	0.0	4	0	0	4
REDWATER	1.0	4	0	0	4
CARSTAIRS	0.0	3	2	0	5
COUTTS	3.4	0	0	6	6
FOREMOST	1.4	3	3	0	6
FORT ASSINIBOINE	1.8	5	1	0	6
HANNA	.9	6	0	0	6
MANNVILLE	.7	6	0	0	6
THORHILD	.7	6	0	0	6
VEGREVILLE	12.4	6	0	0	6
GRANDE CACHE	6.0	0	7	0	7
LINDEN	3.1	4	3	0	7
NAMPA	4.0	7	0	0	7
STRATHMORE	14.0	5	2	0	7
NOBLEFORD	.5	0	8	0	8
PENHOLD	5.9	8	0	0	8
BASHAW	6.3	0	9	0	9
BOWDEN	.9	9	0	0	9
FORT MACLEOD	1.6	9	0	0	9
PLAMONDON	7.7	9	0	0	9
TURNER VALLEY	1.2	9	0	0	9
GRANUM	.9	7	3	0	10
DEVON	14.0	6	5	0	11
SMOKY LAKE	19.7	11	0	0	11
DRAYTON VALLEY	21.7	12	0	0	12
ATHABASCA	1.8	5	7	1	13
MANNING	0.0	13	0	0	13
CLYDE	3.7	9	5	0	14
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	14	0	0	14
BEISEKER	0.0	15	0	0	15
THORSBY	0.0	9	6	0	15
ALIX	1.5	10	6	0	16
BOYLE	1.6	16	0	0	16
BRETON	5.5	10	5	1	16
CANMORE	84.0	13	0	4	17
STONY PLAIN	38.5	0	19	0	19
INNISFAIL	25.0	14	6	0	20
ST. PAUL	0.0	20	0	0	20
DIDSBURY	0.0	18	3	0	21
BARRHEAD	7.0	22	0	0	22
SWAN HILLS	14.8	11	11	0	22
WARBURG	5.0	23	0	0	23
RIMBEY	6.0	24	1	0	25
MAYERTHORPE	24.5	6	20	0	26
BROOKS	30.5	27	0	0	27
BRUDERHEIM	3.8	27	0	0	27
HIGH LEVEL	15.0	0	0	27	27
TWO HILLS	38.0	5	25	0	30
WHITECOURT	51.4	21	9	0	30
OLDS	12.8	28	0	3	31
IRVINE	2.3	20	12	0	32
HYTHE	9.4	30	4	0	34
CORONATION	8.0	18	17	0	35
STETTLER	18.2	32	4	0	36
VAUXHALL	13.3	35	6	0	41
FAIRVIEW	23.2	41	2	0	43
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	50	0	50
MORINVILLE	19.5	48	5	0	53
HIGH PRAIRIE	61.4	70	2	0	72
EDSON	65.2	70	18	0	88
REDCLIFF	44.1	89	0	0	89
TOTALS	771.9	956	295	42	1,293
%		74	23	3	100

TABLE 1.2.4

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED COMMERCIAL LOTS
By Vacant Commercial Lots per Capita
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Vacant Commercial: Lots (1986)	Area (1986)	Lots Per Capita
ALIX	837	12	1.5	.0143
ATHABASCA	1,933	8	1.8	.0041
BARNWELL	373	0	0.0	0.0000
BARRHEAD	3,849	29	7.0	.0075
BASHAW	875	6	6.3	.0068
BEISEKER	648	15	0.0	.0231
BOWDEN	983	10	.9	.0102
BOYLE	703	18	1.6	.0256
BRETON	534	16	5.5	.0300
BROOKS	9,421	58	30.5	.0062
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	31	3.8	.0250
CALMAR	1,137	3	.8	.0026
CANMORE	4,012	101	84.0	.0252
CARSTAIRS	1,725	3	0.0	.0017
CAYLEY	232	0	0.0	0.0000
CLYDE	406	13	3.7	.0320
CORONATION	1,268	26	8.0	.0205
COUTTS	400	9	3.4	.0225
DEVON	3,931	20	14.0	.0051
DIDSBURY	3,219	18	0.0	.0056
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	34	21.7	.0068
ECKVILLE	842	0	0.0	0.0000
EDSON	7,110	135	65.2	.0190
FAIRVIEW	3,234	64	23.2	.0198
FOREMOST	617	4	1.4	.0065
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	7	1.8	.0327
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	11	1.6	.0035
FOX CREEK	1,978	0	0.0	0.0000
GIBBONS	2,620	0	0.0	0.0000
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	6	6.0	.0013
GRANUM	399	8	.9	.0200
HANNA	3,036	7	.9	.0023
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	42	15.0	.0147
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,380	131	61.4	.0508
HIGH RIVER	5,114	0	.1	0.0000
HYTHE	681	39	9.4	.0573
INNISFAIL	5,435	39	25.0	.0072
IRVINE	360	22	2.3	.0611
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	0	0.0	0.0000
LACOMBE	5,954	0	0.0	0.0000
LINDEN	461	7	3.1	.0152
LOMOND	204	0	0.0	0.0000
MANNING	1,262	13	0.0	.0103
MANNVILLE	799	7	.7	.0088
MAYERTHORPE	1,475	30	24.5	.0203
MORINVILLE	5,273	68	19.5	.0129
NAMPA	435	11	4.0	.0253
NOBLEFORD	547	0	.5	0.0000
OLDS	4,932	44	12.8	.0089
ONOWAY	669	4	0.0	.0060
PENHOLD	1,588	14	5.9	.0088
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	14	0.0	.0090
PLAMONDON	271	17	7.7	.0627
REDCLIFF	3,814	133	44.1	.0349
REDWATER	2,197	5	1.0	.0023
RIMBEY	1,906	30	6.0	.0157
ROCKYFORD	292	2	0.0	.0068
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	31	19.7	.0266
ST. PAUL	5,052	20	0.0	.0040
STANDARD	379	0	0.0	0.0000
STETTLER	5,136	50	18.2	.0097
STONY PLAIN	5,291	38	38.5	.0072
STRATHMORE	3,530	19	14.0	.0054
SWAN HILLS	2,497	26	14.8	.0104
THORHILD	366	7	.7	.0124
THORSBY	737	9	0.0	.0122
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	10	1.2	.0077
TWO HILLS	1,330	43	38.0	.0323
VAUXHALL	492	48	13.3	.0976
VEGREVILLE	5,251	18	12.4	.0034
VULCAN	1,307	6	6.2	.0040
WARBURG	552	28	5.0	.0507
WHITECOURT	5,408	72	51.4	.0133
TOTALS	163,615	1,769	771.9	.0153 (Avg.)

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED COMMERCIAL LOTS
By Vacant Commercial Lots per Capita
(ordered by lots per capita)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Vacant Commercial: Lots (1986)	Area (1986)	Lots Per Capita
BARNWELL	373	0	0.0	0.0000
CAYLEY	232	0	0.0	0.0000
ECKVILLE	842	0	0.0	0.0000
FOX CREEK	1,978	0	0.0	0.0000
GIBBONS	2,620	0	0.0	0.0000
HIGH RIVER	5,114	0	.1	0.0000
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	0	0.0	0.0000
LACOMBE	5,954	0	0.0	0.0000
LOMOND	204	0	0.0	0.0000
NOBLEFORD	547	0	.5	0.0000
STANDARD	379	0	0.0	0.0000
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	6	6.0	.0013
CARSTAIRS	1,725	3	0.0	.0017
REDWATER	2,197	5	1.0	.0023
HANNA	3,036	7	.9	.0023
CALMAR	1,137	3	.8	.0026
VEGREVILLE	5,251	18	12.4	.0034
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	11	1.6	.0035
ST. PAUL	5,052	20	0.0	.0040
VULCAN	1,507	6	6.2	.0040
ATHABASCA	1,933	8	1.8	.0041
DEVON	3,931	20	14.0	.0051
STRATHMORE	3,530	19	14.0	.0054
DIDSBURY	3,219	18	0.0	.0056
ONOWAY	669	4	0.0	.0060
BROOKS	9,421	58	30.5	.0062
FOREMOST	617	4	1.4	.0065
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	34	21.7	.0068
ROCKYFORD	292	2	0.0	.0068
BASHAW	875	6	6.3	.0068
INNISFAIL	5,435	39	25.0	.0072
STONY PLAIN	5,291	38	38.5	.0072
BARRHEAD	3,849	29	7.0	.0075
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	10	1.2	.0077
MANNVILLE	799	7	.7	.0088
PENHOLD	1,588	14	5.9	.0088
OLDS	4,932	44	12.8	.0089
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	14	0.0	.0090
STETTLER	5,136	50	18.2	.0097
BOWDEN	983	10	.9	.0102
MANNING	1,262	13	0.0	.0103
SWAN HILLS	2,497	26	14.8	.0104
THORSBY	737	9	0.0	.0122
THORNILD	566	7	.7	.0124
MORINVILLE	5,273	68	19.5	.0129
WHITECOURT	5,408	72	51.4	.0133
ALIX	837	12	1.5	.0143
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	42	15.0	.0147
LINDEN	461	7	3.1	.0152
RIMBEY	1,906	30	6.0	.0157
EDSON	7,110	135	65.2	.0190
FAIRVIEW	3,234	64	23.2	.0198
GRANUM	399	8	.9	.0200
MAYERTHORPE	1,475	30	24.5	.0203
CORONATION	1,268	26	8.0	.0205
COUTTS	400	9	1.4	.0225
BEISEKER	648	15	0.0	.0231
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	31	3.8	.0250
CANMORE	4,012	101	84.0	.0252
NAMPA	435	11	4.0	.0253
BOYLE	703	18	1.6	.0256
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	31	19.7	.0266
BRETON	534	16	5.5	.0300
CLYDE	406	13	3.7	.0320
TWO HILLS	1,330	43	38.0	.0323
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	7	1.8	.0327
REDCLIFF	3,814	133	44.1	.0349
WARBURG	552	28	5.0	.0507
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	131	61.4	.0508
HYTHE	681	39	9.4	.0573
IRVINE	360	22	2.3	.0611
PLAMONDON	271	17	7.7	.0627
VAUXHALL	492	48	13.3	.0976
TOTALS	163,615	1,769	771.9	.0153 (Avg.)

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED INDUSTRIAL LOTS
By Ownership
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	Area (Ac)	Ownership of Lots: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
ALIX	0.0	2	0	0	2
ATHABASCA	27.0	22	0	0	22
BARNWELL	0.0	0	0	0	0
BARRHEAD	45.0	23	22	0	45
BASHAW	17.5	0	16	0	16
BEISEKER	0.0	0	0	12	12
BOWDEN	2.5	2	0	0	2
BOYLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
BRETON	0.0	4	1	0	5
BROOKS	41.2	0	12	0	12
BRUDERHEIM	0.0	0	0	0	0
CALMAR	59.0	0	0	20	20
CANMORE	0.0	0	17	59	76
CARSTAIRS	25.2	0	0	33	33
CAYLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
CLYDE	28.3	11	3	0	14
CORONATION	20.0	8	7	0	15
COUTTS	1.4	0	0	2	2
DEVON	10.8	0	22	0	22
DIDSBURY	0.0	16	0	0	16
DRAYTON VALLEY	26.9	18	0	0	18
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
EDSON	25.0	25	8	0	33
FAIRVIEW	30.1	15	1	0	16
FOREMOST	6.5	0	14	0	14
FORT ASSINIBOINE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FORT MACLEOD	70.2	6	71	0	77
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	0	0	0
GIBBONS	0.0	0	6	0	6
GRANDE CACHE	12.0	0	14	0	14
GRANUM	5.9	0	8	0	8
HANNA	7.3	7	0	0	7
HIGH LEVEL	33.0	0	33	0	33
HIGH PRAIRIE	51.7	29	0	0	29
HIGH RIVER	2.5	0	2	0	2
HYTHE	28.5	7	3	0	10
INNISFAIL	40.0	0	21	2	23
IRVINE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LAC LA BICHE	15.7	0	10	0	10
LACOMBE	0.0	0	5	0	5
LINDEN	1.5	1	3	0	4
LOMOND	.4	0	0	1	1
MANNING	0.0	0	0	0	0
MANNVILLE	.7	1	0	0	1
MAYERTHORPE	0.0	0	0	0	0
MORINVILLE	90.2	44	1	0	45
NAMPA	3.9	2	0	0	2
NOBLEFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
OLDS	81.0	50	14	0	64
ONOWAY	25.0	0	19	0	19
PENHOLD	4.2	7	1	0	8
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	0	16	0	16
PLAMONDON	0.0	0	0	0	0
REDCLIFF	49.4	49	0	0	49
REDWATER	34.0	0	0	29	29
RIMBEY	.9	6	0	0	6
ROCKYFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
SMOKY LAKE	8.5	7	0	0	7
ST. PAUL	8.0	5	3	0	8
STANDARD	10.9	0	19	0	19
STETTLER	17.7	5	7	0	12
STONY PLAIN	36.9	0	33	0	33
STRATHMORE	22.8	12	16	0	28
SWAN HILLS	23.5	0	20	0	20
THORHILD	11.0	4	0	0	4
THORSBY	0.0	2	0	0	2
TURNER VALLEY	35.6	7	0	1	8
TWO HILLS	25.0	3	4	0	7
VAUXHALL	3.0	1	0	0	1
VEGREVILLE	14.8	8	0	0	8
VULCAN	14.8	11	1	0	12
WARBURG	10.0	1	6	0	7
WHITECOURT	12.3	4	11	0	15
TOTALS	1,179.2	425	470	159	1,054
%		40	44	15	100

TABLE 1.3.2

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED INDUSTRIAL LOTS
By Ownership
(ordered by acreage of vacant serviced land)

Municipality	Area (Ac)	Ownership of Lots: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
ALIX	0.0	2	0	0	2
BARNWELL	0.0	0	0	0	0
BEISEKER	0.0	0	0	12	12
BOYLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
BRETON	0.0	4	1	0	5
BRUDERHEIM	0.0	0	0	0	0
CANMORE	0.0	0	17	59	76
CAYLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
DIDSBURY	0.0	16	0	0	16
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FORT ASSINIBOINE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	0	0	0
GIBBONS	0.0	0	6	0	6
IRVINE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LACOMBE	0.0	0	5	0	5
MANNING	0.0	0	0	0	0
MAYERTHORPE	0.0	0	0	0	0
NOBLEFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	0	16	0	16
PLAMONDON	0.0	0	0	0	0
ROCKYFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORSBY	0.0	2	0	0	2
LOMOND	.4	0	0	1	1
MANNVILLE	.7	1	0	0	1
RIMBEY	.9	6	0	0	6
COUTTS	1.4	0	0	2	2
LINDEN	1.5	1	3	0	4
BOWDEN	2.5	2	0	0	2
HIGH RIVER	2.5	0	2	0	2
VAUXHALL	3.0	1	0	0	1
NAMPA	3.9	2	0	0	2
PENHOLD	4.2	7	1	0	8
GRAHUN	5.9	0	8	0	8
FOREMOST	6.5	0	14	0	14
HANNA	7.3	7	0	0	7
ST. PAUL	8.0	5	3	0	8
SMOKY LAKE	8.5	7	0	0	7
WARBURG	10.0	1	6	0	7
DEVON	10.8	0	22	0	22
STANDARD	10.9	0	19	0	19
THORHILD	11.0	4	0	0	4
GRANDE CACHE	12.0	0	14	0	14
WHITECOURT	12.3	4	11	0	15
VEGREVILLE	14.8	8	0	0	8
VULCAN	14.8	11	1	0	12
LAC LA BICHE	15.7	0	10	0	10
BASHAW	17.5	0	16	0	16
STETTLER	17.7	5	7	0	12
CORONATION	20.0	8	7	0	15
STRATHMORE	22.8	12	16	0	28
SWAN HILLS	23.5	0	20	0	20
EDSON	25.0	25	8	0	33
ONOWAY	25.0	0	19	0	19
TWO HILLS	25.0	3	4	0	7
CARSTAIRS	25.2	0	0	33	33
DRAYTON VALLEY	26.9	18	0	0	18
ATHABASCA	27.0	22	0	0	22
CLYDE	28.3	11	3	0	14
HYTHE	28.5	7	3	0	10
FAIRVIEW	30.1	15	1	0	16
HIGH LEVEL	33.0	0	33	0	33
REDWATER	34.0	0	0	29	29
TURNER VALLEY	35.6	7	0	1	8
STONY PLAIN	36.9	0	33	0	33
INNISFAIL	40.0	0	21	2	23
BROOKS	41.2	0	12	0	12
BARRHEAD	45.0	23	22	0	45
REDCLIFF	49.4	49	0	0	49
HIGH PRAIRIE	51.7	29	0	0	29
CALMAR	59.0	0	0	20	20
FORT MACLEOD	70.2	6	71	0	77
OLDS	81.0	50	14	0	64
MORINVILLE	90.2	44	1	0	45
TOTALS	1,179.2	425	470	159	1,054
%		40	44	15	100

TABLE 1.3.3

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED INDUSTRIAL LOTS
By Ownership
(ordered by number of serviced lots)

Municipality	Area (Ac)	Ownership of Lots: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
BARNWELL	0.0	0	0	0	0
BOYLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
BRUDERHEIM	0.0	0	0	0	0
CAYLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FORT ASSINIBOINE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	0	0	0
IRVINE	0.0	0	0	0	0
MANNING	0.0	0	0	0	0
MAYERTHORPE	0.0	0	0	0	0
NOBLEFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
PLAMONDON	0.0	0	0	0	0
ROCKYFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
LOMOND	.4	0	0	1	1
MANNVILLE	.7	1	0	0	1
VAUXHALL	3.0	1	0	0	1
ALIX	0.0	2	0	0	2
BOWDEN	2.5	2	0	0	2
COUTTS	1.4	0	0	2	2
HIGH RIVER	2.5	0	2	0	2
NAMPA	3.9	2	0	0	2
THORSBY	0.0	2	0	0	2
LINDEN	1.5	1	3	0	4
THORHILD	11.0	4	0	0	4
BRETON	0.0	4	1	0	5
LACOMBE	0.0	0	5	0	5
GIBBONS	0.0	0	6	0	6
RIMBEY	.9	6	0	0	6
HANNA	7.3	7	0	0	7
SMOKY LAKE	8.5	7	0	0	7
TWO HILLS	25.0	3	4	0	7
WARBURG	10.0	1	6	0	7
GRANUM	5.9	0	8	0	8
PENHOLD	4.2	7	1	0	8
ST. PAUL	8.0	5	3	0	8
TURNER VALLEY	35.6	7	0	1	8
VEGREVILLE	14.8	8	0	0	8
HYTHE	28.5	7	3	0	10
LAC LA BICHE	15.7	0	10	0	10
BEISEKER	0.0	0	0	12	12
BROOKS	41.2	0	12	0	12
STETTLER	17.7	5	7	0	12
VULCAN	14.8	11	1	0	12
CLYDE	28.3	11	3	0	14
FORESTOST	6.5	0	14	0	14
GRANDE CACHE	12.0	0	14	0	14
CORONATION	20.0	8	7	0	15
WHITECOURT	12.3	4	11	0	15
BASHAW	17.5	0	16	0	16
DIDSBURY	0.0	16	0	0	16
FAIRVIEW	30.1	15	1	0	16
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	0	16	0	16
DRAYTON VALLEY	26.9	18	0	0	18
ONOWAY	25.0	0	19	0	19
STANDARD	10.9	0	19	0	19
CALMAR	59.0	0	0	20	20
SWAN HILLS	23.5	0	20	0	20
ATHABASCA	27.0	22	0	0	22
DEVON	10.8	0	22	0	22
INNISFAIL	40.0	0	21	2	23
STRATHMORE	22.8	12	16	0	28
HIGH PRAIRIE	51.7	29	0	0	29
REDWATER	34.0	0	0	29	29
CARSTAIRS	25.2	0	0	33	33
EDSON	25.0	25	8	0	33
HIGH LEVEL	33.0	0	33	0	33
STONY PLAIN	36.9	0	33	0	33
BARRHEAD	45.0	23	22	0	45
MORINVILLE	90.2	44	1	0	45
REDCLIFF	49.4	49	0	0	49
OLDS	81.0	50	14	0	64
CANMORE	0.0	0	17	59	76
FORT MACLEOD	70.2	6	71	0	77
TOTALS	1,179.2	425	470	159	1,054
%		40	44	15	100

TABLE 1.3.4

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED INDUSTRIAL LOTS
By Vacant Serviced Industrial Lots per Capita
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Vacant Industrial: Lots (1986)	Area (1986)	Lots Per Capita
ALIX	837	2	0.0	.0024
ATHABASCA	1,933	22	27.0	.0114
BARNWELL	373	0	0.0	0.0000
BARRHEAD	3,849	45	45.0	.0117
BASHAW	875	16	17.5	.0183
BEISEKER	648	12	0.0	.0185
BOWDEN	983	2	2.5	.0020
BOYLE	703	0	0.0	0.0000
BRETON	534	5	0.0	.0094
BROOKS	9,421	12	41.2	.0013
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	0	0.0	0.0000
CALMAR	1,137	20	39.0	.0176
CANMORE	4,012	76	0.0	.0189
CARSTAIRS	1,725	33	25.2	.0191
CAYLEY	232	0	0.0	0.0000
CLYDE	406	14	28.3	.0345
CORONATION	1,268	15	20.0	.0118
COUTTS	400	2	1.4	.0050
DEVON	3,931	22	10.8	.0056
DIDSBURY	3,219	16	0.0	.0050
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	18	26.9	.0036
ECKVILLE	842	0	0.0	0.0000
EDSON	7,110	33	23.0	.0046
FAIRVIEW	3,234	16	30.1	.0049
FOREMOST	617	14	6.5	.0227
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	0	0.0	0.0000
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	77	70.2	.0245
FOX CREEK	1,978	0	0.0	0.0000
GIBBONS	2,620	6	0.0	.0023
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	14	12.0	.0030
GRANUM	399	8	5.9	.0200
HANNA	3,036	7	7.3	.0023
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	33	33.0	.0116
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	29	51.7	.0112
HIGH RIVER	5,114	2	2.5	.0004
HYTHE	681	10	28.5	.0147
INNISFAIL	5,435	23	40.0	.0042
IRVINE	360	0	0.0	0.0000
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	10	15.7	.0045
LACOMBE	5,954	3	0.0	.0008
LINDEN	461	4	1.5	.0087
LOMOND	204	1	.4	.0049
MANNING	1,262	0	0.0	0.0000
MANNVILLE	799	1	.7	.0012
MAYERTHORPE	1,473	0	0.0	0.0000
MORINVILLE	5,273	45	90.2	.0085
NAMPA	435	2	3.9	.0046
NOBLEFORD	547	0	0.0	0.0000
OLDS	4,932	64	81.0	.0130
ONOWAY	669	19	25.0	.0284
PENNOLD	1,588	8	4.2	.0050
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	16	0.0	.0102
PLAMONDON	271	0	0.0	0.0000
REDCLIFF	3,814	49	49.4	.0128
REDWATER	2,197	29	34.0	.0132
RIMBEY	1,906	6	.9	.0031
ROCKYFORD	292	0	0.0	0.0000
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	7	8.5	.0060
ST. PAUL	5,052	8	8.0	.0016
STANDARD	379	19	10.9	.0501
STETTLER	5,136	12	17.7	.0023
STONY PLAIN	5,291	33	36.9	.0062
STRATHMORE	3,530	28	22.8	.0079
SWAN HILLS	2,497	20	23.5	.0080
THORHILD	566	4	11.0	.0071
THORSBY	737	2	0.0	.0027
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	8	35.6	.0062
TWO HILLS	1,330	7	25.0	.0053
VAUXHALL	492	1	3.0	.0020
VEGREVILLE	5,231	8	14.8	.0015
VULCAN	1,597	12	14.8	.0080
WARBURG	552	15	10.0	.0272
WHITECOURT	5,408	0	12.3	0.0000
TOTALS	163,615	1,047	1,179.2	.0080 (Avg.)

TABLE 1.3.5

INVENTORY OF VACANT SERVICED INDUSTRIAL LOTS
By Vacant Serviced Industrial Lots per Capita
(ordered by lots per capita)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Vacant Industrial: Lots (1986)	Area (1986)	Lots Per Capita
BARNWELL	373	0	0.0	0.0000
BOYLE	703	0	0.0	0.0000
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	0	0.0	0.0000
CAYLEY	232	0	0.0	0.0000
ECKVILLE	842	0	0.0	0.0000
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	0	0.0	0.0000
FOX CREEK	1,978	0	0.0	0.0000
IRVINE	360	0	0.0	0.0000
MANNING	1,262	0	0.0	0.0000
MAYERTHORPE	1,475	0	0.0	0.0000
NOBLEFORD	347	0	0.0	0.0000
PLAMONDON	271	0	0.0	0.0000
ROCKYFORD	292	0	0.0	0.0000
WHITECOURT	5,408	0	12.3	0.0000
HIGH RIVER	5,114	2	2.5	.0004
LACOMBE	5,954	5	0.0	.0008
MANNVILLE	799	1	.7	.0012
BROOKS	9,421	12	41.2	.0013
VEGREVILLE	5,251	8	14.8	.0015
ST. PAUL	5,052	8	8.0	.0016
VAUXHALL	492	1	3.0	.0020
BOWDEN	983	2	2.5	.0020
GIBBONS	2,620	6	0.0	.0023
HANNA	3,036	7	7.3	.0023
STETTLER	5,136	12	17.7	.0023
ALIX	837	2	0.0	.0024
THORSBY	737	2	0.0	.0027
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	14	12.0	.0030
RIMBEY	1,906	6	.9	.0031
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	18	26.9	.0036
INNISFAIL	5,435	23	40.0	.0042
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	10	15.7	.0045
NAMPA	435	2	3.9	.0046
EDSON	7,110	33	25.0	.0046
LOMOND	204	1	.4	.0049
FAIRVIEW	3,234	16	30.1	.0049
DIDSBURY	3,219	16	0.0	.0050
COUTTS	400	2	1.4	.0050
PENHOLD	1,588	8	4.2	.0050
TWO HILLS	1,330	7	25.0	.0053
DEVON	3,931	22	10.8	.0056
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	7	8.5	.0060
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	8	35.6	.0062
STONY PLAIN	5,291	33	36.9	.0062
THORNILD	566	4	11.0	.0071
STRATHMORE	3,530	28	22.8	.0079
VULCAN	1,507	12	14.8	.0080
SWAN HILLS	2,497	20	23.5	.0080
MORINVILLE	5,273	45	90.2	.0085
LINDEN	461	4	1.5	.0087
BRETON	534	5	0.0	.0094
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	16	0.0	.0102
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	29	51.7	.0112
ATHABASCA	1,933	22	27.0	.0114
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	33	33.0	.0116
BARRHEAD	3,849	45	45.0	.0117
CORONATION	1,268	15	20.0	.0118
REDCLIFF	3,814	49	49.4	.0128
OLDS	4,932	64	81.0	.0130
REDWATER	2,197	29	34.0	.0132
HYTHE	681	10	28.5	.0147
CALMAR	1,137	20	59.0	.0176
BASHAW	875	16	17.5	.0183
BEISEKER	648	12	0.0	.0185
CANMORE	4,012	76	0.0	.0189
CARSTAIRS	1,725	33	25.2	.0191
GRANUM	399	8	5.9	.0200
FOREMOST	617	14	6.5	.0227
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	77	70.2	.0245
WARBURG	552	15	10.0	.0272
ONOWAY	669	19	25.0	.0284
CLYDE	406	14	28.3	.0345
STANDARD	379	19	10.9	.0501
TOTALS	163,615	1,047	1,179.2	.0080 (Avg.)

TABLE 1.4.1

INVENTORY OF VACANT MISCELLANEOUS LOTS
By Ownership
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	Area (Ac)	Ownership of Lots: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
BROOKS	10.0	2	0	0	2
CALMAR	.1	1	0	0	1
DIDSBURY	0.0	1	3	0	4
EDSON	109.5	20	0	0	20
HANNA	.4	3	0	0	3
IRVINE	12.5	7	0	0	7
MANNING	0.0	2	0	0	2
MORINVILLE	26.4	0	2	0	2
OLDS	0.0	29	0	0	29
WHITECOURT	3.1	0	1	1	2
NOBLEFORD	.1	0	1	0	1
THORSBY	0.0	74	0	0	74
TOTALS	162.1	139	7	1	147
%		94	5	1	100

TABLE 2.1.1

RESIDENTIAL LAND AND LOTS IN PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT
By Ownership
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	Total Area	Lots Under Development Land Ownership By: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
ALIX	0.0	0	0	0	0
ATHABASCA	4.1	2	0	0	2
BARNWELL	45.0	1	0	0	1
BARRHEAD	0.0	0	0	0	0
BASHAW	51.9	0	0	1	1
BEISEKER	0.0	0	0	0	0
BOWDEN	90.0	0	0	1	1
BOYLE	2.8	1	7	0	8
BRETON	6.0	11	0	0	11
BROOKS	69.0	180	0	0	180
BRUDERHEIM	21.7	155	0	0	155
CALMAR	35.6	4	0	0	4
CANMORE	38.0	0	0	2	2
CARSTAIRS	27.0	48	0	0	48
CAYLEY	2.0	0	0	10	10
CLYDE	0.0	0	0	0	0
CORONATION	70.0	1	0	0	1
COUTTS	3.6	0	0	23	23
DEVON	32.3	67	0	52	119
DIDSBURY	10.0	1	0	0	1
DRAYTON VALLEY	12.3	19	36	0	55
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
EDSON	94.7	3	109	154	266
FAIRVIEW	63.3	29	0	0	29
FOREMOST	20.3	48	27	0	75
FORT ASSINIBOINE	3.5	18	0	0	18
FORT MACLEOD	131.0	2	219	0	221
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	0	0	0
GIBBONS	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANDE CACHE	15.0	0	0	106	106
GRANUM	0.0	0	0	0	0
HANNA	147.1	1	1	0	2
HIGH LEVEL	0.0	0	0	0	0
HIGH PRAIRIE	131.5	2	0	46	48
HIGH RIVER	3.5	0	29	0	29
HYTHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
INNISFAIL	20.0	40	35	0	75
IRVINE	37.6	0	108	0	108
LAC LA BICHE	2.0	0	9	0	9
LACOMBE	10.0	40	0	0	40
LINDEN	0.0	0	0	0	0
LOMOND	6.7	36	0	0	36
MANNING	58.2	21	3	0	24
MANNVILLE	32.0	0	1	0	1
MAYERTHORPE	24.3	0	70	0	70
MORINVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
NAMPA	0.0	0	0	0	0
NOBLEFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
OLDS	81.0	3	0	0	3
ONOWAY	0.0	0	0	0	0
PENHOLD	0.0	4	0	0	4
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	0	0	0	0
PLAMONDON	51.2	44	0	0	44
REDCLIFF	56.8	217	0	0	217
REDWATER	0.0	0	0	0	0
RIMBEY	7.0	2	0	0	2
ROCKYFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
SMOKY LAKE	2.0	9	0	0	9
ST. PAUL	102.5	14	0	0	14
STANDARD	0.0	0	0	0	0
STETTLER	21.2	0	127	14	141
STONY PLAIN	23.0	138	0	0	138
STRATHMORE	63.9	35	191	0	226
SWAN HILLS	71.7	200	2	0	202
THORHILD	40.1	7	0	0	7
THORSBY	0.0	0	0	0	0
TURNER VALLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
TWO HILLS	35.3	0	96	0	96
VAUXHALL	.2	1	0	0	1
VEGREVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
VULCAN	7.4	12	44	0	56
WARBURG	0.0	0	0	0	0
WHITECOURT	28.3	35	0	0	35
TOTALS	1913.6	1,451	1,114	409	2,974
%		49	37	14	100

TABLE 2.1.2

RESIDENTIAL LAND AND LOTS IN PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT
By Ownership
(ordered by acreage of land proposed for residential development)

Municipality	Total Area	Lots Under Development Land Ownership By: Private	Municipal	Provincial	Total Lots
ALIX	0.0	0	0	0	0
BARRHEAD	0.0	0	0	0	0
BEISEKER	0.0	0	0	0	0
CLYDE	0.0	0	0	0	0
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	0	0	0
GIBBONS	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANUM	0.0	0	0	0	0
HIGH LEVEL	0.0	0	0	0	0
HYTHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LINDEN	0.0	0	0	0	0
MORINVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
NAMPA	0.0	0	0	0	0
NOBLEFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
ONOWAY	0.0	0	0	0	0
PENHOLD	0.0	4	0	0	4
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	0	0	0	0
REDWATER	0.0	0	0	0	0
ROCKYFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
STANDARD	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORSBY	0.0	0	0	0	0
TURNER VALLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
VEGREVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
WARBURG	0.0	0	0	0	0
VAUXHALL	.2	1	0	0	1
CAYLEY	2.0	0	0	10	10
LAC LA BICHE	2.0	0	9	0	9
SMOKY LAKE	2.0	9	0	0	9
BOYLE	2.8	1	7	0	8
FORT ASSINIBOINE	3.5	18	0	0	18
HIGH RIVER	3.5	0	29	0	29
COUTTS	3.6	0	0	23	23
ATHABASCA	4.1	2	0	0	2
BRETON	6.0	11	0	0	11
LOMOND	6.7	36	0	0	36
RIMBEY	7.0	2	0	0	2
VULCAN	7.4	12	44	0	56
DIDSBURY	10.0	1	0	0	1
LACOMBE	10.0	40	0	0	40
DRAYTON VALLEY	12.3	19	36	0	55
GRANDE CACHE	15.0	0	0	106	106
INNISFAIL	20.0	40	35	0	75
FOREMOST	20.3	48	27	0	75
STETTLER	21.2	0	127	14	141
BRUDERHEIM	21.7	155	0	0	155
STONY PLAIN	23.0	138	0	0	138
MAYERTHORPE	24.3	0	70	0	70
CARSTAIRS	27.0	48	0	0	48
WHITECOURT	28.3	35	0	0	35
MANNVILLE	32.0	0	1	0	1
DEVON	32.3	67	0	52	119
TWO HILLS	35.3	0	96	0	96
CALMAR	35.6	4	0	0	4
IRVINE	37.6	0	108	0	108
CANMORE	38.0	0	0	2	2
THORHILD	40.1	7	0	0	7
BARNWELL	45.0	1	0	0	1
PLAMONDON	51.2	44	0	0	44
BASHAW	51.9	0	0	1	1
REDCLIFF	56.8	217	0	0	217
MANNING	58.2	21	3	0	24
FAIRVIEW	63.3	29	0	0	29
STRATHMORE	63.9	35	191	0	226
BROOKS	69.0	180	0	0	180
CORONATION	70.0	1	0	0	1
SWAN HILLS	71.7	200	2	0	202
OLDS	81.0	3	0	0	3
BOWDEN	90.0	0	0	1	1
EDSON	94.7	3	109	154	266
ST. PAUL	102.5	14	0	0	14
FORT MACLEOD	131.0	2	219	0	221
HIGH PRAIRIE	131.5	2	0	46	48
HANNA	147.1	1	1	0	2
TOTALS	1913.6	1,451	1,114	409	2,974
%		49	37	14	100

TABLE 2.1.3

RESIDENTIAL LAND AND LOTS IN PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT
By Ownership
(ordered by number of proposed residential lots)

Municipality	Total Area	Lots Under Development Land Ownership By: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
ALIX	0.0	0	0	0	0
BARRHEAD	0.0	0	0	0	0
BEISEKER	0.0	0	0	0	0
CLYDE	0.0	0	0	0	0
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	0	0	0
GIBBONS	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANUM	0.0	0	0	0	0
HIGH LEVEL	0.0	0	0	0	0
HYTHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LINDEN	0.0	0	0	0	0
MORINVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
NAMPA	0.0	0	0	0	0
NOBLEFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
ONOWAY	0.0	0	0	0	0
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	0	0	0	0
REDWATER	0.0	0	0	0	0
ROCKYFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
STANDARD	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORSBY	0.0	0	0	0	0
TURNER VALLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
VEGREVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
WARBURG	0.0	0	0	0	0
BARNWELL	45.0	1	0	0	1
BASHAW	51.9	0	0	1	1
BOWDEN	90.0	0	0	1	1
CORONATION	70.0	1	0	0	1
DIDSBURY	10.0	1	0	0	1
HANNVILLE	32.0	0	1	0	1
VAUXHALL	.2	1	0	0	1
ATHABASCA	4.1	2	0	0	2
CANMORE	38.0	0	0	2	2
HANNA	147.1	1	1	0	2
RIMBEY	7.0	2	0	0	2
OLDS	81.0	3	0	0	3
CALMAR	35.6	4	0	0	4
PENHOLD	0.0	4	0	0	4
THORNILD	40.1	7	0	0	7
BOYLE	2.8	1	7	0	8
LAC LA BICHE	2.0	0	9	0	9
SMOKY LAKE	2.0	9	0	0	9
CAYLEY	2.0	0	0	10	10
BRETON	6.0	11	0	0	11
ST. PAUL	102.5	14	0	0	14
FORT ASSINIBOINE	3.5	18	0	0	18
COUTTS	3.6	0	0	23	23
MANNING	58.2	21	3	0	24
FAIRVIEW	63.3	29	0	0	29
HIGH RIVER	3.5	0	29	0	29
WHITECOURT	28.3	35	0	0	35
LOMOND	6.7	36	0	0	36
LACOMBE	10.0	40	0	0	40
PLAMONDON	51.2	44	0	0	44
CARSTAIRS	27.0	48	0	0	48
HIGH PRAIRIE	131.5	2	0	46	48
DRAYTON VALLEY	12.3	19	36	0	55
VULCAN	7.4	12	44	0	56
MAYERTHORPE	24.3	0	70	0	70
FOREMOST	20.3	48	27	0	75
INNISFAIL	20.0	40	35	0	75
TWO HILLS	35.3	0	96	0	96
GRANDE CACHE	15.0	0	0	106	106
IRVINE	37.6	0	108	0	108
DEVON	32.3	67	0	52	119
STONY PLAIN	23.0	138	0	0	138
STETTLER	21.2	0	127	14	141
BRUDERHEIM	21.7	155	0	0	155
BROOKS	69.0	180	0	0	180
SWAN HILLS	71.7	200	2	0	202
REDCLIFF	56.8	217	0	0	217
FORT MACLEOD	131.0	2	219	0	221
STRATHMORE	63.9	35	191	0	226
EDSON	94.7	3	109	154	266
TOTALS	1913.6	1,451	1,114	409	2,974
%		49	37	14	100

TABLE 2.2.1

COMMERCIAL LAND AND LOTS IN PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT
By Ownership
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	Total Area	Lots Under Development — Land Ownership By: Private	Municipal	Provincial	Total Lots
ALIX	0.0	0	0	0	0
ATHABASCA	.3	2	0	0	2
BARNWELL	0.0	0	0	0	0
BARRHEAD	0.0	0	0	0	0
BASHAW	0.0	0	0	0	0
BEISEKER	0.0	0	0	0	0
BOWDEN	0.0	0	0	0	0
BOYLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
BRETON	0.0	0	0	0	0
BROOKS	0.0	0	0	0	0
BRUDERHEIM	0.0	0	0	0	0
CALMAR	0.0	0	0	0	0
CANMORE	120.0	0	0	8	8
CARSTAIRS	12.8	8	0	0	8
CAYLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
CLYDE	0.0	0	0	0	0
CORONATION	0.0	0	0	0	0
COUTTS	1.7	0	0	3	3
DEVON	2.2	0	0	1	1
DIDSBURY	0.0	0	0	0	0
DRAYTON VALLEY	2.5	11	0	0	11
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
EDSON	4.5	12	0	0	12
FAIRVIEW	9.9	7	0	0	7
FOREMOST	1.8	0	3	0	3
FORT ASSINIBOINE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FORT MACLEOD	66.1	0	9	0	9
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	0	0	0
GIBBONS	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANDE CACHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANUM	0.0	0	0	0	0
HANNA	0.0	0	0	0	0
HIGH LEVEL	0.0	0	0	0	0
HIGH PRAIRIE	0.0	0	0	0	0
HIGH RIVER	1.6	0	1	0	1
HYTHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
INNISFAIL	0.0	0	0	0	0
IRVINE	40.9	0	3	0	3
LAC LA BICHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LACOMBE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LINDEN	2.1	1	6	0	7
LOMOND	1.1	0	3	0	3
MANNING	0.0	0	0	0	0
MANNVILLE	15.0	0	0	0	0
MAYERTHORPE	0.0	0	0	0	0
MORINVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
NAMPA	0.0	0	0	0	0
NOBLEFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
OLDS	0.0	0	0	0	0
ONOWAY	0.0	0	0	0	0
PENHOLD	0.0	0	0	0	0
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	2	1	0	3
PLAMONDON	2.8	5	0	0	5
REDCLIFF	0.0	0	0	0	0
REDWATER	0.0	0	0	0	0
RIMBEY	13.3	1	0	0	1
ROCKYFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
SMOKY LAKE	0.0	0	0	0	0
ST. PAUL	30.0	10	0	0	10
STANDARD	0.0	0	0	0	0
STETTLER	24.4	5	2	0	7
STONY PLAIN	0.0	0	0	0	0
STRATHMORE	23.7	24	0	3	27
SWAN HILLS	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORHILD	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORSBY	0.0	0	0	0	0
TURNER VALLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
TWO HILLS	18.0	1	11	0	12
VAUXHALL	.8	1	0	0	1
VEGREVILLE	1.2	0	0	1	1
VULCAN	4.9	1	0	0	1
WARBURG	0.0	0	0	0	0
WHITECOURT	0.0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	401.6	91	39	16	146
%		62	27	11	100

TABLE 2.2.2

COMMERCIAL LAND AND LOTS IN PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT
By Ownership
(ordered by acreage of land proposed for commercial development)

Municipality	Total Land Area	Lots Under Development Ownership By: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
ALIX	0.0	0	0	0	0
BARNWELL	0.0	0	0	0	0
BARRHEAD	0.0	0	0	0	0
BASHAW	0.0	0	0	0	0
BEISEKER	0.0	0	0	0	0
BOWDEN	0.0	0	0	0	0
BOYLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
BRETON	0.0	0	0	0	0
BROOKS	0.0	0	0	0	0
BRUDERHEIM	0.0	0	0	0	0
CALMAR	0.0	0	0	0	0
CAYLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
CLYDE	0.0	0	0	0	0
CORONATION	0.0	0	0	0	0
DIDSBURY	0.0	0	0	0	0
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FORT ASSINIBOINE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	0	0	0
GIBBONS	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANDE CACHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANUM	0.0	0	0	0	0
HANNA	0.0	0	0	0	0
HIGH LEVEL	0.0	0	0	0	0
HIGH PRAIRIE	0.0	0	0	0	0
HYTHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
INNISFAIL	0.0	0	0	0	0
LAC LA BICHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LACOMBE	0.0	0	0	0	0
MANNING	0.0	0	0	0	0
MAYERTHORPE	0.0	0	0	0	0
MORINVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
NAMPA	0.0	0	0	0	0
NOBLEFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
OLDS	0.0	0	0	0	0
ONOWAY	0.0	0	0	0	0
PENHOLD	0.0	0	0	0	0
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	2	1	0	3
REDCLIFF	0.0	0	0	0	0
REDWATER	0.0	0	0	0	0
ROCKYFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
SMOKY LAKE	0.0	0	0	0	0
STANDARD	0.0	0	0	0	0
STONY PLAIN	0.0	0	0	0	0
SWAN HILLS	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORHILD	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORSBY	0.0	0	0	0	0
TURNER VALLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
WARBURG	0.0	0	0	0	0
WHITECOURT	0.0	0	0	0	0
ATHABASCA	.3	2	0	0	2
VAUXHALL	.8	1	0	0	1
LOMOND	1.1	0	3	0	3
VEGREVILLE	1.2	0	0	1	1
HIGH RIVER	1.6	0	1	0	1
COUTTS	1.7	0	0	3	3
FOREMOST	1.8	0	3	0	3
LINDEN	2.1	1	6	0	7
DEVON	2.2	0	0	1	1
DRAYTON VALLEY	2.5	11	0	0	11
PLAMONDON	2.8	5	0	0	5
EDSON	4.5	12	0	0	12
VULCAN	4.9	1	0	0	1
FAIRVIEW	9.9	7	0	0	7
CARSTAIRS	12.8	8	0	0	8
RIMBEY	13.3	1	0	0	1
HANNVILLE	15.0	0	0	0	0
TWO HILLS	18.0	1	11	0	12
STRATHMORE	23.7	24	0	3	27
STETTLER	24.4	5	2	0	7
ST. PAUL	30.0	10	0	0	10
IRVINE	40.9	0	3	0	3
FORT MACLEOD	66.1	0	9	0	9
CANMORE	120.0	0	0	8	8
TOTALS	401.6	91	39	16	146
%		62	27	11	100

TABLE 2.2.3

COMMERCIAL LAND AND LOTS IN PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT
By Ownership
(ordered by number of proposed commercial lots)

Municipality	Total Area	Lots Under Development Land Ownership By: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
ALIX	0.0	0	0	0	0
BARNWELL	0.0	0	0	0	0
BARRHEAD	0.0	0	0	0	0
BASHAW	0.0	0	0	0	0
BEISEKER	0.0	0	0	0	0
BOWDEN	0.0	0	0	0	0
BOYLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
BRETON	0.0	0	0	0	0
BROOKS	0.0	0	0	0	0
BRUDERHEIM	0.0	0	0	0	0
CALMAR	0.0	0	0	0	0
CAYLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
CLYDE	0.0	0	0	0	0
CORONATION	0.0	0	0	0	0
DIDSBURY	0.0	0	0	0	0
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FORT ASSINIBOINE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	0	0	0
GIBBONS	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANDE CACHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANUM	0.0	0	0	0	0
HANNA	0.0	0	0	0	0
HIGH LEVEL	0.0	0	0	0	0
HIGH PRAIRIE	0.0	0	0	0	0
HYTHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
INNISFAIL	0.0	0	0	0	0
LAC LA BICHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LACOMBE	0.0	0	0	0	0
MANNING	0.0	0	0	0	0
MANNVILLE	15.0	0	0	0	0
MAYERTHORPE	0.0	0	0	0	0
MORINVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
NAMPA	0.0	0	0	0	0
NOBLEFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
OLDS	0.0	0	0	0	0
ONOWAY	0.0	0	0	0	0
PENHOLD	0.0	0	0	0	0
REDCLIFF	0.0	0	0	0	0
REDWATER	0.0	0	0	0	0
ROCKYFORD	0.0	0	0	0	0
SMOKY LAKE	0.0	0	0	0	0
STANDARD	0.0	0	0	0	0
STONY PLAIN	0.0	0	0	0	0
SWAN HILLS	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORHILD	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORSBY	0.0	0	0	0	0
TURNER VALLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
WARBURG	0.0	0	0	0	0
WHITECOURT	0.0	0	0	0	0
DEVON	2.2	0	0	1	1
HIGH RIVER	1.6	0	1	0	1
KINSEY	13.3	1	0	0	1
VAUXHALL	.8	1	0	0	1
VEGREVILLE	1.2	0	0	1	1
VULCAN	4.9	1	0	0	1
ATHABASCA	.3	2	0	0	2
COUTTS	1.7	0	0	3	3
FOREMOST	1.8	0	3	0	3
IRVINE	40.9	0	3	0	3
LOMOND	1.1	0	3	0	3
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	2	1	0	3
PLAMONDON	2.8	5	0	0	5
FAIRVIEW	9.9	7	0	0	7
LINDEN	2.1	1	6	0	7
STETTLER	24.4	5	2	0	7
CANMORE	120.0	0	0	8	8
CARSTAIRS	12.8	8	0	0	8
FORT MACLEOD	66.1	0	9	0	9
ST. PAUL	30.0	10	0	0	10
DRAYTON VALLEY	2.5	11	0	0	11
EDSON	4.5	12	0	0	12
TWO HILLS	18.0	1	11	0	12
STRATHMORE	23.7	24	0	3	27
TOTALS	401.6	91	39	16	146
%		62	27	11	100

TABLE 2.3.1

INDUSTRIAL LAND AND LOTS IN PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT
By Ownership
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	Total Area	Lots Under Development — Land Ownership By: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
ALIX	24.0	1	0	0	1
ATHABASCA	5.0	11	0	0	11
BARNWELL	0.0	0	0	0	0
BARRHEAD	0.0	0	0	0	0
BASHAW	67.4	0	57	0	57
BEISEKER	0.0	0	0	0	0
BOWDEN	20.0	0	0	1	1
BOYLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
BRETON	0.0	0	0	0	0
BROOKS	17.8	0	24	0	24
BRUDERHEIM	160.0	3	0	0	3
CALMAR	0.0	0	0	0	0
CANMORE	0.0	0	0	0	0
CARSTAIRS	0.0	0	0	0	0
CAYLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
CLYDE	0.0	0	0	0	0
CORONATION	0.0	0	0	0	0
COUTTS	4.0	0	0	6	6
DEVON	66.0	0	0	44	44
DIDSBURY	0.0	0	0	0	0
DRAYTON VALLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
EDSON	21.8	4	0	1	5
FAIRVIEW	17.7	9	0	0	9
FORESTOST	0.0	0	0	0	0
FORT ASSINIBOINE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FORT MACLEOD	131.5	3	219	0	222
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	0	0	0
GIBBONS	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANDE CACHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANUM	0.0	0	0	0	0
HANNA	24.3	1	0	0	1
HIGH LEVEL	0.0	0	0	0	0
HIGH PRAIRIE	10.9	1	0	0	1
HIGH RIVER	2.5	0	2	0	2
HYTHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
INNISFAIL	90.0	0	0	1	1
IRVINE	13.4	0	1	0	1
LAC LA BICHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LACOMBE	103.0	0	1	0	1
LINDEN	0.0	0	0	0	0
LOMOND	.4	0	0	1	1
MANNING	22.0	22	0	0	22
MANNVILLE	40.0	0	18	0	18
MAYERTHORPE	43.3	39	0	0	39
MORINVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
NAMPA	0.0	0	0	0	0
NOBLEFORD	13.6	0	0	12	12
OLDS	18.5	0	1	0	1
ONOWAY	0.0	0	0	0	0
PENHOLD	0.0	0	0	0	0
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	0	0	0	0
PLAMONDON	0.0	0	0	0	0
REDCLIFF	0.0	0	0	0	0
REDWATER	0.0	0	0	0	0
RIMBEY	41.6	1	0	0	1
ROCKYFORD	18.0	1	0	0	1
SMOKY LAKE	0.0	0	0	0	0
ST. PAUL	50.0	1	0	0	1
STANDARD	2.3	0	1	0	1
STETTLER	138.5	2	3	0	5
STONY PLAIN	43.2	0	1	0	1
STRATHMORE	5.5	2	0	0	2
SWAN HILLS	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORHILD	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORSBY	0.0	0	0	0	0
TURNER VALLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
TWO HILLS	84.0	3	1	0	4
VAUXHALL	.6	1	0	0	1
VEGREVILLE	125.1	8	4	30	42
VULCAN	39.5	15	0	0	15
WARBURG	0.0	0	0	0	0
WHITECOURT	31.5	26	0	0	26
TOTALS	1496.9	154	333	96	583
%		26	57	16	100

TABLE 2.3.2

INDUSTRIAL LAND AND LOTS IN PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT
By Ownership
(ordered by acreage of land proposed for industrial development)

Municipality	Total Area	Lots Under Development Land Ownership By: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
BARNWELL	0.0	0	0	0	0
BARRHEAD	0.0	0	0	0	0
BEISEKER	0.0	0	0	0	0
BOYLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
BRETON	0.0	0	0	0	0
CALMAR	0.0	0	0	0	0
CANMORE	0.0	0	0	0	0
CARSTAIRS	0.0	0	0	0	0
CAYLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
CLYDE	0.0	0	0	0	0
CORONATION	0.0	0	0	0	0
DIDSBURY	0.0	0	0	0	0
DRAYTON VALLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FOREMOST	0.0	0	0	0	0
FORT ASSINIBOINE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	0	0	0
GIBBONS	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANDE CACHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANUM	0.0	0	0	0	0
HIGH LEVEL	0.0	0	0	0	0
HYTHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LAC LA BICHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LINDEN	0.0	0	0	0	0
MORINVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
NAMPA	0.0	0	0	0	0
ONOWAY	0.0	0	0	0	0
PENHOLD	0.0	0	0	0	0
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	0	0	0	0
PLAMONDON	0.0	0	0	0	0
REDCLIFF	0.0	0	0	0	0
REDWATER	0.0	0	0	0	0
SMOKY LAKE	0.0	0	0	0	0
SWAN HILLS	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORNILD	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORSBY	0.0	0	0	0	0
TURNER VALLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
WARBURG	0.0	0	0	0	0
LOMOND	.4	0	0	1	1
VAUXHALL	.6	1	0	0	1
STANDARD	2.3	0	1	0	1
HIGH RIVER	2.5	0	2	0	2
COUTTS	4.0	0	0	6	6
ATHABASCA	5.0	11	0	0	11
STRATHMORE	5.5	2	0	0	2
HIGH PRAIRIE	10.9	1	0	0	1
IRVINE	13.4	0	1	0	1
NOBLEFORD	13.6	0	0	12	12
FAIRVIEW	17.7	9	0	0	9
BROOKS	17.8	0	24	0	24
ROCKYFORD	18.0	1	0	0	1
OLDS	18.5	0	1	0	1
BOWDEN	20.0	0	0	1	1
EDSON	21.8	4	0	1	5
MANNING	22.0	22	0	0	22
ALIX	24.0	1	0	0	1
HANNA	24.3	1	0	0	1
WHITECOURT	31.5	26	0	0	26
VULCAN	39.5	15	0	0	15
MANNVILLE	40.0	0	18	0	18
RIMBEY	41.6	1	0	0	1
STONY PLAIN	43.2	0	1	0	1
MAYERTHORPE	43.3	39	0	0	39
ST. PAUL	50.0	1	0	0	1
DEVON	66.0	0	0	44	44
BASHAW	67.4	0	57	0	57
TWO HILLS	84.0	3	1	0	4
INNISFAIL	90.0	0	0	1	1
LACOMBE	103.0	0	1	0	1
VEGREVILLE	125.1	8	4	30	42
FORT MACLEOD	131.5	3	219	0	222
STETTLER	138.5	2	3	0	5
BRUDERHEIM	160.0	3	0	0	3
TOTALS	1496.9	154	333	96	583
%		26	57	16	100

INDUSTRIAL LAND AND LOTS IN PROCESS OF DE[illegible]ENT
By Ownership
(ordered by number of proposed industrial lots)

Municipality	Total Area	Lots Under Development — Land Ownership By: Private	Munic	Prov	Total Lots
BARNWELL	0.0	0	0	0	0
BARRHEAD	0.0	0	0	0	0
BEISEKER	0.0	0	0	0	0
BOYLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
BRETON	0.0	0	0	0	0
CALMAR	0.0	0	0	0	0
CANMORE	0.0	0	0	0	0
CARSTAIRS	0.0	0	0	0	0
CAYLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
CLYDE	0.0	0	0	0	0
CORONATION	0.0	0	0	0	0
DIDSBURY	0.0	0	0	0	0
DRAYTON VALLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
ECKVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FOREMOST	0.0	0	0	0	0
FORT ASSINIBOINE	0.0	0	0	0	0
FOX CREEK	0.0	0	0	0	0
GIBBONS	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANDE CACHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
GRANUM	0.0	0	0	0	0
HIGH LEVEL	0.0	0	0	0	0
HYTHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LAC LA BICHE	0.0	0	0	0	0
LINDEN	0.0	0	0	0	0
MORINVILLE	0.0	0	0	0	0
NAMPA	0.0	0	0	0	0
ONOWAY	0.0	0	0	0	0
PENHOLD	0.0	0	0	0	0
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	0	0	0	0
PLAMONDON	0.0	0	0	0	0
REDCLIFF	0.0	0	0	0	0
REDWATER	0.0	0	0	0	0
SMOKY LAKE	0.0	0	0	0	0
SWAN HILLS	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORHILD	0.0	0	0	0	0
THORSBY	0.0	0	0	0	0
TURNER VALLEY	0.0	0	0	0	0
WARBURG	0.0	0	0	0	0
ALIX	24.0	1	0	0	1
BOWDEN	20.0	0	0	1	1
HANNA	24.3	1	0	0	1
HIGH PRAIRIE	10.9	1	0	0	1
INNISFAIL	90.0	0	0	1	1
IRVINE	13.4	0	1	0	1
LACOMBE	103.0	0	1	0	1
LOMOND	.4	0	0	1	1
OLDS	18.5	0	1	0	1
RIMBEY	41.6	1	0	0	1
ROCKYFORD	18.0	1	0	0	1
ST. PAUL	50.0	1	0	0	1
STANDARD	2.3	0	1	0	1
STONY PLAIN	43.2	0	1	0	1
VAUXHALL	.6	1	0	0	1
HIGH RIVER	2.5	0	2	0	2
STRATHMORE	5.5	2	0	0	2
BRUDERHEIM	160.0	3	0	0	3
TWO HILLS	84.0	3	1	0	4
EDSON	21.8	4	0	1	5
STETTLER	138.5	2	3	0	5
COUTTS	4.0	0	0	6	6
FAIRVIEW	17.7	9	0	0	9
ATHABASCA	5.0	11	0	0	11
NOBLEFORD	13.6	0	0	12	12
VULCAN	39.5	15	0	0	15
MANNVILLE	40.0	0	18	0	18
MANNING	22.0	22	0	0	22
BROOKS	17.8	0	24	0	24
WHITECOURT	31.5	26	0	0	26
MAYERTHORPE	43.3	39	0	0	39
VEGREVILLE	125.1	8	4	30	42
DEVON	66.0	0	0	44	44
BASHAW	67.4	0	57	0	57
FORT MACLEOD	131.5	3	219	0	222
TOTALS	1496.9	154	333	96	583
%		26	57	16	100

TABLE 3.1.1

ESTIMATED DENSITY OF LANDS DESIGNATED FOR RESIDENTIAL USE
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Total Designated Res. Land	Estimated: Occupied Residential Acreage	Density of Occupied Res. Land	
ALIX	837	147.5	135.9	6.2	
ATHABASCA	1,933	434.7	385.3	5.0	
BARNWELL	373	75.9	25.8	14.4	
BARRHEAD	3,849	451.4	433.4	8.9	
BASHAW	875	173.9	105.6	8.3	
BEISEKER	648	87.7	87.7	7.4	
BOWDEN	983	125.3	21.9	44.9	
BOYLE	703	89.3	81.8	8.6	
BRETON	534	251.5	240.7	2.2	
BROOKS	9,421	738.8	633.6	14.9	
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	271.3	240.9	5.1	
CALNAR	1,137	178.9	116.9	9.7	
CANMORE	4,012	652.0	550.0	7.3	
CARSTAIRS	1,725	227.6	200.6	8.6	
CAYLEY	232	28.7	26.7	8.7	
CLYDE	406	73.3	59.5	6.8	
CORONATION	1,268	227.3	156.6	8.1	
COUTTS	400	60.2	54.0	7.4	
DEVON	3,931	300.2	261.7	15.0	
DIDSBURY	3,219	449.8	439.8	7.3	
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	499.9	446.9	11.1	
ECKVILLE	842	139.3	133.3	6.3	
EDSON	7,110	651.6	522.8	13.6	
FAIRVIEW	3,234	541.7	415.0	7.8	
FOREMOST	617	98.7	73.5	8.4	
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	32.4	9.9	21.6	
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	416.4	267.6	11.7	
FOX CREEK	1,978	218.2	218.2	9.1	
GIBBONS	2,620	301.4	301.4	8.7	
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	407.9	311.4	14.8	
GRANUM	399	50.0	46.3	8.6	
HANNA	3,036	285.0	129.6	23.4	
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	284.3	266.5	10.7	
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	301.9	154.2	16.7	
HIGH RIVER	5,114	498.7	485.3	10.5	
HYTHE	681	103.4	86.8	7.8	
INNISFAIL	5,435	514.1	477.1	11.4	
IRVINE	360	108.5	60.5	6.0	
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	194.2	178.0	12.6	
LACOMBE	5,954	604.7	594.7	10.0	
LINDEN	461	74.0	66.5	6.9	
LOMOND	204	53.8	45.1	4.5	
MANNING	1,262	214.4	145.8	8.6	
MANNVILLE	799	150.4	102.4	7.8	
MAYERTHORPE	1,475	190.9	135.9	9.5	
MORINVILLE	5,273	439.5	381.3	13.8	
NAMPA	435	112.6	102.6	4.2	
NOBLEFORD	547	76.4	73.3	7.5	
OLDS	4,932	661.1	510.1	9.7	
ONOWAY	669	215.4	215.4	3.1	
PENHOLD	1,588	148.0	146.7	10.8	
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	189.8	189.8	8.2	
PLAMONDON	271	105.2	50.8	5.3	
REDCLIFF	3,814	450.1	374.0	10.2	
REDWATER	2,197	255.0	234.0	9.4	
RIMBEY	1,906	224.6	187.7	10.2	
ROCKYFORD	292	39.2	39.2	7.4	
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	142.0	119.2	9.8	
ST. PAUL	5,052	676.7	574.2	8.8	
STANDARD	379	61.1	56.1	6.8	
STETTLER	5,136	555.8	509.8	10.1	
STONY PLAIN	3,291	544.9	484.9	10.9	
STRATHMORE	3,530	341.8	227.2	15.5	
SWAN HILLS	2,497	222.2	142.8	17.5	
THORHILD	566	121.7	71.9	7.9	
THORSBY	737	128.5	128.5	5.7	
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	212.0	201.2	6.4	
TWO HILLS	1,330	214.0	153.4	8.7	
VAUXHALL	492	148.3	126.0	3.9	
VEGREVILLE	5,251	735.8	666.6	7.9	
VULCAN	1,507	174.2	142.4	10.6	
WARBURG	552	204.2	179.2	3.1	
WHITECOURT	5,408	458.8	377.8	14.3	
TOTALS	163,615	19,840	16,619	9.9	(Avg.)

TABLE 3.1.2

ESTIMATED DENSITY OF LANDS DESIGNATED FOR RESIDENTIAL USE
(ordered by density of occupied areas)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Total Designated Res. Land	Estimated: Occupied Residential Acreage	Density of Occupied Res. Land
BRETON	534	251.5	240.7	2.2
WARBURG	552	204.2	179.2	3.1
ONOWAY	669	215.4	215.4	3.1
VAUXHALL	492	148.3	126.0	3.9
NAMPA	435	112.6	102.6	4.2
LOMOND	204	53.8	45.1	4.5
ATHABASCA	1,933	434.7	385.3	5.0
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	271.3	240.9	5.1
PLAMONDON	371	105.2	50.8	5.3
THORSBY	737	128.5	128.5	5.7
IRVINE	360	108.5	60.5	6.0
ALIX	837	147.5	135.9	6.2
ECKVILLE	842	139.3	133.3	6.3
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	212.0	201.2	6.4
STANDARD	379	61.1	56.1	6.8
CLYDE	406	73.3	59.5	6.8
LINDEN	461	74.0	66.5	6.9
CANMORE	4,012	652.0	550.0	7.3
DIDSBURY	3,219	449.8	439.8	7.3
BEISEKER	648	87.7	87.7	7.4
COUTTS	400	60.2	54.0	7.4
ROCKYFORD	292	39.2	39.2	7.4
NOBLEFORD	547	76.4	73.3	7.5
FAIRVIEW	3,234	541.7	415.0	7.8
HANNVILLE	799	150.4	102.4	7.8
HYTHE	681	103.4	86.8	7.8
THORHILD	566	121.7	71.9	7.9
VEGREVILLE	5,251	735.8	666.6	7.9
CORONATION	1,268	227.3	156.6	8.1
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	189.8	189.8	8.2
BASHAW	875	173.9	105.6	8.3
FOREMOST	617	98.7	73.5	8.4
BOYLE	703	89.3	81.8	8.6
CARSTAIRS	1,725	227.6	200.6	8.6
GRANUM	399	50.0	46.3	8.6
MANNING	1,262	214.4	145.8	8.6
TWO HILLS	1,330	214.0	153.4	8.7
CAYLEY	232	28.7	26.7	8.7
GIBBONS	2,620	301.4	301.4	8.7
ST. PAUL	5,052	676.7	574.2	8.8
BARRHEAD	3,849	451.4	433.4	8.9
FOX CREEK	1,978	218.2	218.2	9.1
REDWATER	2,197	255.0	234.0	9.4
MAYERTHORPE	1,475	190.9	155.9	9.5
OLDS	4,932	661.1	510.1	9.7
CALMAR	1,137	178.9	116.9	9.7
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	142.0	119.2	9.8
LACOMBE	5,954	604.7	594.7	10.0
STETTLER	5,136	353.8	509.8	10.1
RIMBEY	1,906	224.6	187.7	10.2
REDCLIFF	3,814	450.1	374.0	10.2
HIGH RIVER	5,114	498.7	485.3	10.5
VULCAN	1,507	174.2	142.4	10.6
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	284.3	266.5	10.7
PENNOLD	1,588	148.0	140.7	10.8
STONY PLAIN	5,291	544.9	484.9	10.9
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	499.9	446.9	11.1
INNISFAIL	5,435	514.1	477.1	11.4
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	416.4	267.6	11.7
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	194.2	178.0	12.6
EDSON	7,110	651.6	522.8	13.6
MORINVILLE	5,273	439.5	381.3	13.8
WHITECOURT	5,408	458.8	377.8	14.3
BARNWELL	373	75.9	25.8	14.4
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	407.9	311.4	14.8
BROOKS	9,421	738.8	633.6	14.9
DEVON	3,931	300.2	261.7	15.0
STRATHMORE	3,530	341.8	227.2	15.5
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	301.9	154.2	16.7
SWAN HILLS	2,497	222.2	142.8	17.5
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	32.4	9.9	21.6
HANNA	3,036	285.0	129.6	23.4
BOWDEN	983	125.3	21.9	44.9
TOTALS	163,615	19,840	16,619	9.9 (Avg.)

ESTIMATED DENSITY OF LANDS DESIGNATED FOR RESIDENTIAL USE
(ordered by population of the municipality)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Total Designated Res. Land	Estimated: Occupied Residential Acreage	Density of Occupied Res. Land
LOMOND	204	53.8	45.1	4.5
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	32.4	9.9	21.6
CAYLEY	232	28.7	26.7	8.7
PLAMONDON	271	105.2	50.8	5.3
ROCKYFORD	292	39.2	39.2	7.4
IRVINE	360	108.5	60.5	6.0
BARNWELL	373	75.9	25.8	14.4
STANDARD	379	61.1	56.1	6.8
GRANUM	399	50.0	46.3	8.6
COUTTS	400	60.2	54.0	7.4
CLYDE	406	73.3	59.5	6.8
NAMPA	435	112.6	102.6	4.2
LINDEN	461	74.0	66.5	6.9
VAUXHALL	492	148.3	126.0	3.9
BRETON	534	251.5	240.7	2.2
NOBLEFORD	547	76.4	73.3	7.5
WARBURG	552	204.2	179.2	3.1
THORHILD	566	121.7	71.9	7.9
FOREMOST	617	98.7	73.5	8.4
BEISEKER	648	87.7	87.7	7.4
ONOWAY	669	215.4	215.4	3.1
HYTHE	681	103.4	86.8	7.8
BOYLE	703	89.3	81.8	8.6
THORSBY	737	128.5	128.5	5.7
HANNVILLE	799	150.4	102.4	7.8
ALIX	837	147.5	135.9	6.2
ECKVILLE	842	139.3	133.3	6.3
BASHAW	875	173.9	105.6	8.3
BOWDEN	983	125.3	21.9	44.9
CALMAR	1,137	178.9	116.9	9.7
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	142.0	119.2	9.8
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	271.3	240.9	5.1
MANNING	1,262	214.4	145.8	8.6
CORONATION	1,268	227.3	156.6	8.1
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	212.0	201.2	6.4
TWO HILLS	1,330	214.0	153.4	8.7
MAYERTHORPE	1,475	190.9	135.9	9.5
VULCAN	1,507	174.2	142.4	10.6
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	189.8	189.8	8.2
PENHOLD	1,588	148.0	146.7	10.8
CARSTAIRS	1,725	227.6	200.6	8.6
RIMBEY	1,906	224.6	187.7	10.2
ATHABASCA	1,933	434.7	385.3	5.0
FOX CREEK	1,978	218.2	218.2	9.1
REDWATER	2,197	255.0	234.0	9.4
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	194.2	178.0	12.6
SWAN HILLS	2,497	222.2	142.8	17.5
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	301.9	154.2	16.7
GIBBONS	2,620	301.4	301.4	8.7
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	284.3	266.5	10.7
HANNA	3,036	285.0	129.6	23.4
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	416.4	267.6	11.7
DIDSBURY	3,219	449.8	439.8	7.3
FAIRVIEW	3,234	541.7	415.0	7.8
STRATHMORE	3,530	341.8	227.2	15.5
REDCLIFF	3,814	450.1	374.0	10.2
BARRHEAD	3,849	451.4	433.4	8.9
DEVON	3,931	300.2	261.7	15.0
CANMORE	4,012	652.0	550.0	7.3
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	407.9	311.4	14.8
OLDS	4,932	661.1	510.1	9.7
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	499.9	446.9	11.1
ST. PAUL	5,052	676.7	574.2	8.8
HIGH RIVER	5,114	498.7	485.3	10.5
STETTLER	5,136	555.8	509.8	10.1
VEGREVILLE	5,251	735.8	666.6	7.9
MORINVILLE	5,273	439.5	381.3	13.8
STONY PLAIN	5,291	544.9	484.9	10.9
WHITECOURT	5,408	458.8	377.8	14.3
INNISFAIL	5,435	514.1	477.1	11.4
LACOMBE	5,954	604.7	594.7	10.0
EDSON	7,110	651.6	522.8	13.6
BROOKS	9,421	738.8	633.6	14.9
TOTALS	163,615	19,840	16,619	9.9 (Avg.)

TABLE 3.2.1

RESIDENTIAL CAPACITY OF VACANT AND DEVELOPING LOTS AT EXISTING DENSITY
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Estimated Density of Occupied Res. Land	Capacity of: Vacant Serviced Res. Land	Res. Land Under Development	Total Capacity: Serviced & Dev'g Lands	As % of Existing Population
ALIX	837	[illegible]	71	0	71	8.5
ATHABASCA	1,933	21.6	227	20	[illegible]	12.8
BARNWELL	373	8.7	[illegible]	650	724	194.1
BARRHEAD	3,849	5.3	160	0	160	[illegible].2
BASHAW	875	[illegible]	136	[illegible]30	566	64.7
BEISEKER	648	6.0	0	0	0	0.0
BOWDEN	983	[illegible]	601	[illegible]	[illegible]641	[illegible]72.1
BOYLE	703	6.8	[illegible]0	24	64	9.1
BRETON	534	8.6	11	13	24	[illegible].5
BROOKS	9,[illegible]21	[illegible]	[illegible]5	1,026	1,071	11.[illegible]
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	6.8	[illegible]3	112	157	12.7
CALMAR	1,137	[illegible].2	257	346	603	53.0
CANMORE	[illegible],012	6.9	[illegible]67	277	[illegible]44	18.5
CARSTAIRS	1,725	3.9	0	232	232	13.[illegible]
CAYLEY	232	2.2	0	17	17	7.3
CLYDE	[illegible]06	7.5	9[illegible]	0	9[illegible]	23.2
CORONATION	1,268	3.1	6	567	573	[illegible]5.2
COUTTS	[illegible]00	7.9	19	27	[illegible]6	11.5
DEVON	3,931	8.[illegible]	93	[illegible]85	578	1[illegible].7
DIDSBURY	3,219	7.[illegible]	0	73	73	2.3
DRAYTON VALLEY	[illegible],982	3.1	[illegible]54	137	391	11.9
ECKVILLE	842	7.8	38	0	38	[illegible].5
EDSON	7,110	8.6	[illegible]64	1,288	1,752	24.6
FAIRVIEW	3,234	5.7	[illegible]9[illegible]	[illegible]93	987	30.5
FOREMOST	617	7.8	[illegible]1	170	211	34.2
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	6.2	[illegible]11	76	[illegible]87	227.6
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	6.3	209	1,537	1,746	55.6
FOX CREEK	1,978	8.3	0	0	0	0.0
GIBBONS	2,620	[illegible].9	0	0	0	0.0
GRANDE CACHE	[illegible],624	9.7	1,210	223	1,433	31.0
GRANUM	399	9.8	32	0	32	8.0
HANNA	3,036	5.1	194	3,[illegible]46	3,640	119.9
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	8.6	190	0	190	6.7
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	8.1	271	2,200	2,[illegible]71	95.8
HIGH RIVER	5,114	6.[illegible]	104	37	141	2.8
HYTHE	681	8.7	130	0	130	19.1
INNISFAIL	5,[illegible]35	9.5	194	228	[illegible]22	7.8
IRVINE	360	10.6	62	224	286	79.[illegible]
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	8.2	179	25	204	9.1
LACOMBE	5,9[illegible]	10.8	0	100	100	1.7
LINDEN	[illegible]61	8.6	52	0	52	11.3
LOMOND	204	10.2	9	30	39	19.1
MANNING	1,262	5.0	90	504	594	47.1
MANNVILLE	799	9.1	125	250	375	46.9
MAYERTHORPE	1,[illegible]75	9.[illegible]	101	230	331	22.[illegible]
MORINVILLE	5,273	12.6	805	0	805	15.3
NAMPA	[illegible]35	17.5	42	0	[illegible]2	9.6
NOBLEFORD	547	16.7	23	0	23	[illegible].2
OLDS	[illegible],932	8.7	677	783	1,[illegible]60	29.6
ONOWAY	669	10.7	0	0	0	0.0
PENHOLD	1,588	23.[illegible]	14	0	14	.9
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	11.7	0	0	0	0.0
PLAMONDON	271	7.3	17	273	290	107.0
REDCLIFF	3,814	7.8	197	579	776	20.3
REDWATER	2,197	13.5	197	0	197	9.0
RIMBEY	1,906	10.2	304	71	375	19.7
ROCKYFORD	292	8.9	0	0	0	0.0
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	13.0	203	20	223	19.1
ST. PAUL	5,052	7.3	0	902	902	17.8
STANDARD	379	14.8	34	0	34	9.0
STETTLER	5,136	9.7	250	214	[illegible]64	9.0
STONY PLAIN	5,291	11.1	[illegible]04	231	635	12.[illegible]
STRATHMORE	3,530	8.8	788	993	1,781	50.[illegible]
SWAN HILLS	2,497	10.5	135	1,234	1,389	55.6
THORNHILD	566	10.1	76	316	392	69.2
THORSBY	737	7.9	0	0	0	0.0
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	13.8	70	0	70	5.[illegible]
TWO HILLS	1,330	10.9	219	306	525	39.5
VAUXHALL	[illegible]92	14.3	86	1	87	17.7
VEGREVILLE	5,251	11.[illegible]	543	0	543	10.[illegible]
VULCAN	1,507	10.0	238	78	336	22.3
WARBURG	552	13.6	77	0	77	13.9
WHITECOURT	5,408	14.9	734	405	1,139	21.[illegible]
TOTALS	163,615		13,575	25,983	39,558	34.1 (Avg.)

TABLE 3.2.2

RESIDENTIAL CAPACITY OF VACANT AND DEVELOPING LOTS AT EXISTING DENSITY
(ordered by total calculated capacity)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Estimated Density of Occupied Res. Land	Capacity of: Vacant Serviced Res. Land	Capacity of: Res. Land Under Development	Total Capacity: As % of Existing Population	Total Capacity: Serviced & Dev'g Lands
BEISEKER	648	6.0	0	0	0.0	0
FOX CREEK	1,978	8.3	0	0	0.0	0
GIBBONS	2,620	44.9	0	0	0.0	0
ONOWAY	669	10.7	0	0	0.0	0
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	11.7	0	0	0.0	0
ROCKYFORD	292	8.9	0	0	0.0	0
THORSBY	737	7.9	0	0	0.0	0
PENHOLD	1,588	23.4	14	0	.9	14
CAYLEY	232	2.2	0	17	7.3	17
NOBLEFORD	547	16.7	23	0	4.2	23
BRETON	534	8.6	11	13	4.5	24
GRANUM	399	9.8	32	0	8.0	32
STANDARD	379	14.8	34	0	9.0	34
ECKVILLE	842	7.8	38	0	4.5	38
LOMOND	204	10.2	9	30	19.1	39
NAMPA	435	17.5	42	0	9.6	42
COUTTS	400	7.9	19	27	11.5	46
LINDEN	461	8.6	52	0	11.3	52
BOYLE	703	6.8	40	24	9.1	64
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	13.8	70	0	5.4	70
ALIX	837	4.5	71	0	8.5	71
DIDSBURY	3,219	7.4	0	73	2.3	73
WARBURG	552	13.6	77	0	13.9	77
VAUXHALL	492	14.3	86	1	17.7	87
CLYDE	406	7.5	94	0	23.2	94
LACOMBE	5,954	10.8	0	100	1.7	100
HYTHE	681	8.7	130	0	19.1	130
HIGH RIVER	5,114	6.4	104	37	2.8	141
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	6.8	45	112	12.7	157
BARRHEAD	3,849	5.3	160	0	4.2	160
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	8.6	190	0	6.7	190
REDWATER	2,197	15.5	197	0	9.0	197
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	8.2	179	25	9.1	204
FOREMOST	617	7.8	41	170	34.2	211
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	15.0	203	20	19.1	223
CARSTAIRS	1,725	3.9	0	232	13.4	232
ATHABASCA	1,933	21.6	227	20	12.8	247
IRVINE	360	10.6	62	224	79.4	286
PLAMONDON	271	7.3	17	273	107.0	290
MAYERTHORPE	1,475	9.4	101	230	22.4	331
VULCAN	1,507	10.0	258	78	22.3	336
MANNVILLE	799	9.1	123	250	46.9	373
RIMBEY	1,906	10.2	304	71	19.7	375
THORNILD	566	10.1	76	316	69.2	392
INNISFAIL	5,435	9.5	194	228	7.8	422
STETTLER	5,136	9.7	230	214	9.0	444
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	6.2	411	76	227.6	487
TWO HILLS	1,330	10.9	219	306	39.5	525
VEGREVILLE	5,251	11.4	545	0	10.4	545
BASHAW	875	7.4	136	430	64.7	566
CORONATION	1,268	3.1	6	567	45.2	573
DEVON	3,931	8.4	93	485	14.7	578
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	3.1	454	137	11.9	591
MANNING	1,262	5.0	90	504	47.1	594
CALMAR	1,137	4.2	257	346	53.0	603
STONY PLAIN	5,291	11.1	404	251	12.4	655
BARNWELL	373	8.7	74	650	194.1	724
CANMORE	4,012	6.9	467	277	18.5	744
REDCLIFF	3,814	7.8	197	579	20.3	776
MORINVILLE	5,273	12.6	805	0	15.3	805
ST. PAUL	5,052	7.3	0	902	17.8	902
FAIRVIEW	3,234	5.7	494	493	30.5	987
BROOKS	9,421	7.4	45	1,026	11.4	1,071
WHITECOURT	5,408	14.9	754	405	21.4	1,159
SWAN HILLS	2,497	10.5	135	1,254	55.6	1,389
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	9.7	1,210	223	31.0	1,433
OLDS	4,932	8.7	677	783	29.6	1,460
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	6.3	209	1,537	55.6	1,746
EDSON	7,110	8.6	464	1,288	24.6	1,752
STRATHMORE	3,530	8.8	788	993	50.4	1,781
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	8.1	271	2,200	95.8	2,471
HANNA	3,036	5.1	194	3,446	119.9	3,640
BOWDEN	983	14.4	601	4,040	472.1	4,641
TOTALS	163,615		13,575	25,983		39,558

TABLE 3.2.3

RESIDENTIAL CAPACITY OF VACANT AND DEVELOPING LOTS AT EXISTING DENSITY
(ordered by capacity expressed as a percentage of existing population)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Estimated Density of Occupied Res. Land	Capacity of: Vacant Serviced Res. Land	Capacity of: Res. Land Under Development	Total Capacity: Serviced & Dev'g Lands	Total Capacity: As % of Existing Population
BEISEKER	648	6.0	0	0	0	0.0
FOX CREEK	1,978	8.3	0	0	0	0.0
GIBBONS	2,620	8.9	0	0	0	0.0
ONOWAY	669	10.7	0	0	0	0.0
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	11.7	0	0	0	0.0
ROCKYFORD	292	8.9	0	0	0	0.0
THORSBY	737	7.9	0	0	0	0.0
PENHOLD	1,588	23.4	14	0	14	.9
LACOMBE	5,954	10.8	0	100	100	1.7
DIDSBURY	3,219	7.4	0	73	73	2.3
HIGH RIVER	5,114	6.4	104	37	141	2.8
BARRHEAD	3,849	5.3	160	0	160	4.2
NOBLEFORD	547	16.7	23	0	23	4.2
BRETON	534	8.6	11	13	24	4.5
ECKVILLE	842	7.8	38	0	38	4.5
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	13.8	70	0	70	5.4
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	8.6	190	0	190	6.7
CAYLEY	232	2.2	0	17	17	7.3
INNISFAIL	5,435	9.5	194	228	422	7.8
GRANUM	399	9.8	32	0	32	8.0
ALIX	837	4.5	71	0	71	8.5
REDWATER	2,197	15.5	197	0	197	9.0
STANDARD	379	14.8	34	0	34	9.0
STETTLER	5,136	9.7	250	214	464	9.0
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	8.2	179	25	204	9.1
BOYLE	703	6.8	40	24	64	9.1
NAMPA	435	17.5	42	0	42	9.6
VEGREVILLE	5,251	11.4	545	0	545	10.4
LINDEN	461	8.6	52	0	52	11.3
BROOKS	9,421	7.4	45	1,026	1,071	11.4
COUTTS	400	7.9	19	27	46	11.5
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	3.1	454	137	591	11.9
STONY PLAIN	5,291	11.1	404	251	655	12.4
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	6.8	45	112	157	12.7
ATHABASCA	1,933	21.6	227	20	247	12.8
CARSTAIRS	1,725	3.9	0	232	232	13.4
WARBURG	552	13.6	77	0	77	13.9
DEVON	3,931	8.4	93	485	578	14.7
MORINVILLE	5,273	12.6	805	0	805	15.3
VAUXHALL	492	14.3	86	1	87	17.7
ST. PAUL	5,052	7.3	0	902	902	17.8
CANMORE	4,012	6.9	467	277	744	18.5
HYTHE	681	8.7	130	0	130	19.1
LOMOND	204	10.2	9	30	39	19.1
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	15.0	203	20	223	19.1
RIMBEY	1,906	10.2	304	71	375	19.7
REDCLIFF	3,814	7.8	197	579	776	20.3
WHITECOURT	5,408	14.9	754	405	1,159	21.4
VULCAN	1,507	10.0	258	78	336	22.3
MAYERTHORPE	1,473	9.4	101	230	331	22.4
CLYDE	406	7.5	94	0	94	23.2
EDSON	7,110	8.6	484	1,288	1,752	24.6
OLDS	4,932	8.7	677	783	1,460	29.6
FAIRVIEW	3,234	5.7	494	493	987	30.5
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	9.7	1,210	223	1,433	31.0
FOREMOST	617	7.8	41	170	211	34.2
TWO HILLS	1,330	10.9	219	306	525	39.5
CORONATION	1,268	3.1	6	567	573	45.2
MANNVILLE	799	9.1	125	250	375	46.9
MANNING	1,262	5.0	90	504	594	47.1
STRATHMORE	3,530	8.8	788	993	1,781	50.4
CALMAR	1,137	4.2	257	346	603	53.0
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	6.3	209	1,537	1,746	55.6
SWAN HILLS	2,497	10.5	135	1,254	1,389	55.6
BASHAW	873	7.4	136	430	566	64.7
THORHILD	566	10.1	76	316	392	69.2
IRVINE	360	10.6	62	224	286	79.4
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	8.1	271	2,200	2,471	95.8
PLAMONDON	271	7.3	17	273	290	107.0
HANNA	3,036	5.1	194	3,446	3,640	119.9
BARNWELL	373	8.7	74	650	724	194.1
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	6.2	411	76	487	227.6
BOWDEN	983	14.4	601	4,040	4,641	472.1
TOTALS	163,615		13,575	25,983	39,558	34.1 (Avg.)

TABLE 3.3.1

CARRYING CAPACTIY OF VACANT AND DEVELOPING RESIDENTIAL LOTS
BASED UPON OCCUPANCY OF 3.0 PERSONS PER LOT
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Number Of: Vac. Serv. Res. Lots	Lots Under Development	Total Pop'n Capacity: Vac & Dev Res. Lots	As % of '85 Pop'n
ALIX	837	60	0	180	21.5
ATHABASCA	1,933	172	2	522	27.0
BARNWELL	373	17	1	54	14.5
BARRHEAD	3,849	128	0	384	10.0
BASHAW	875	63	1	192	21.9
BEISEKER	648	61	0	183	28.2
BOWDEN	983	88	1	267	27.2
BOYLE	703	23	8	93	13.2
BRETON	534	25	11	108	20.2
BROOKS	9,421	69	180	747	7.9
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	37	155	576	46.5
CALMAR	1,137	101	4	315	27.7
CANMORE	4,012	553	2	1,665	41.5
CARSTAIRS	1,725	21	48	207	12.0
CAYLEY	232	4	10	42	18.1
CLYDE	406	93	0	279	68.7
CORONATION	1,268	5	1	18	1.4
COUTTS	400	19	23	126	31.5
DEVON	3,931	52	119	513	13.0
DIDSBURY	3,219	125	1	378	11.7
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	105	55	480	9.6
ECKVILLE	842	22	0	66	7.8
EDSON	7,110	143	266	1,227	17.2
FAIRVIEW	3,234	214	29	729	22.5
FOREMOST	617	28	75	309	50.1
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	71	18	267	124.8
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	91	221	936	29.8
FOX CREEK	1,978	180	0	540	27.3
GIBBONS	2,620	194	0	582	22.2
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	189	106	885	19.1
GRANUM	399	23	0	69	17.3
HANNA	3,036	55	2	171	5.6
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	117	0	351	12.3
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	66	48	342	13.2
HIGH RIVER	5,114	50	29	237	4.6
HYTHE	681	117	0	351	51.5
INNISFAIL	5,435	99	75	522	9.6
IRVINE	360	63	108	513	142.5
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	53	9	186	8.3
LACOMBE	5,954	211	40	753	12.6
LINDEN	461	49	0	147	31.9
LOMOND	204	10	36	138	67.6
MANNING	1,262	54	24	234	18.5
MANNVILLE	799	61	1	186	23.3
MAYERTHORPE	1,475	63	70	399	27.0
MORINVILLE	5,273	258	0	774	14.7
NAMPA	435	54	0	162	37.2
NOBLEFORD	547	17	0	51	9.3
OLDS	4,932	326	3	987	20.0
ONOWAY	669	87	0	261	39.0
PENHOLD	1,588	7	4	33	2.1
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	24	0	72	4.6
PLAMONDON	271	10	44	162	59.8
REDCLIFF	3,814	102	217	957	25.1
REDWATER	2,197	87	0	261	11.9
RIMBEY	1,906	147	2	447	23.4
ROCKYFORD	292	17	0	51	17.5
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	84	9	279	23.9
ST. PAUL	5,052	53	14	201	4.0
STANDARD	379	30	0	90	23.7
STETTLER	5,136	117	141	774	15.1
STONY PLAIN	5,291	213	138	1,053	19.9
STRATHMORE	3,530	368	226	1,782	50.5
SWAN HILLS	2,497	15	202	651	26.1
THORHILD	568	47	7	162	28.6
THORSBY	737	96	0	288	39.1
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	64	0	192	14.8
TWO HILLS	1,330	81	96	531	39.9
VAUXHALL	492	53	1	162	32.9
VEGREVILLE	5,251	550	0	1,650	31.4
VULCAN	1,507	109	56	495	32.8
WARBURG	552	92	0	276	50.0
WHITECOURT	5,408	246	35	843	15.6
TOTALS	163,615	7,398	2,974	31,116	26.8 (Avg.)

TABLE 3.3.2

CARRYING CAPACITY OF VACANT AND DEVELOPING RESIDENTIAL LOTS
BASED UPON OCCUPANCY OF 3.0 PERSONS PER LOT
(ordered by total calculated capacity)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Number Of: Vac. Serv. Res. Lots	Lots Under Development	Total Pop'n Capacity: As % of '85 Pop'n	Vac & Dev Res. Lots
CORONATION	1,268	5	1	1.4	18
PENHOLD	1,588	7	4	2.1	33
CAYLEY	232	4	10	18.1	42
NOBLEFORD	547	17	0	9.3	51
ROCKYFORD	292	17	0	17.5	51
BARNWELL	373	17	1	14.5	54
ECKVILLE	842	22	0	7.8	66
GRANUM	399	23	0	17.3	69
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	24	0	4.6	72
STANDARD	379	30	0	23.7	90
BOYLE	703	23	8	13.2	93
BRETON	534	25	11	20.2	108
COUTTS	400	19	23	31.5	126
LOMOND	204	10	36	67.6	138
LINDEN	461	49	0	31.9	147
NAMPA	435	54	0	37.2	162
PLAMONDON	271	10	44	59.8	162
THORNHILD	566	47	7	28.6	162
VAUXHALL	492	53	1	32.9	162
HANNA	3,036	55	2	5.6	171
ALIX	837	60	0	21.5	180
BEISEKER	648	61	0	28.2	183
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	53	9	8.3	186
HANKVILLE	799	61	1	23.3	186
BASHAW	875	63	1	21.9	192
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	64	0	14.8	192
ST. PAUL	5,052	53	14	4.0	201
CARSTAIRS	1,725	21	48	12.0	207
MANNING	1,262	34	24	18.5	234
HIGH RIVER	5,114	30	29	4.6	237
ONOWAY	669	87	0	39.0	261
REDWATER	2,197	87	0	11.9	261
BOWDEN	983	88	1	27.2	267
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	71	18	124.8	267
WARBURG	552	92	0	50.0	276
CLYDE	406	93	0	68.7	279
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	84	9	23.9	279
THORSBY	737	96	0	39.1	288
FOREMOST	617	28	75	50.1	309
CALMAR	1,137	101	4	27.7	315
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	66	48	13.2	342
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	117	0	12.3	351
MYTHE	681	117	0	51.5	351
DIDSBURY	3,219	125	1	11.7	378
BARRHEAD	3,849	128	0	10.0	384
MAYERTHORPE	1,475	63	70	27.0	399
RIMBEY	1,906	147	2	23.4	447
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	105	55	9.6	480
VULCAN	1,507	109	56	32.8	495
DEVON	3,931	52	119	13.0	513
IRVINE	360	63	108	142.5	513
ATHABASCA	1,933	172	2	27.0	522
INNISFAIL	5,433	99	75	9.6	522
TWO HILLS	1,330	81	96	39.9	531
FOX CREEK	1,978	180	0	27.3	540
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	37	155	46.5	576
GIBBONS	2,620	194	0	22.2	582
SWAN HILLS	2,497	15	202	26.1	651
FAIRVIEW	3,234	214	29	22.5	729
BROOKS	9,421	69	180	7.9	747
LACOMBE	5,954	211	40	12.6	753
MORINVILLE	5,273	258	0	14.7	774
STETTLER	5,136	117	141	15.1	774
WHITECOURT	5,408	246	35	15.6	843
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	189	106	19.1	885
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	91	221	29.8	936
REDCLIFF	3,814	102	217	25.1	957
OLDS	4,932	326	3	20.0	987
STONY PLAIN	5,291	213	138	19.9	1,053
EDSON	7,110	143	266	17.2	1,227
VEGREVILLE	5,251	550	0	31.4	1,650
CANMORE	4,012	553	2	41.5	1,665
STRATHMORE	3,530	368	226	50.5	1,782
TOTALS	163,615	7,398	2,974		31,116

TABLE 3.3.3

CARRYING CAPACTIY OF VACANT AND DEVELOPING RESIDENTIAL LOTS
BASED UPON OCCUPANCY OF 3.0 PERSONS PER LOT
(ordered by capacity expressed as a percentage of existing population)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Number Of: Vac. Serv. Res. Lots	Number Of: Lots Under Development	Total Pop'n Capacity: Vac & Dev Res. Lots	Total Pop'n Capacity: As % of '85 Pop'n
CORONATION	1,268	5	1	18	1.4
PENHOLD	1,588	7	4	33	2.1
ST. PAUL	5,052	53	14	201	4.0
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	24	0	72	4.6
HIGH RIVER	5,114	50	29	237	4.6
HANNA	3,036	55	2	171	5.6
ECKVILLE	842	22	0	66	7.8
BROOKS	9,421	69	180	747	7.9
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	53	9	186	8.3
NOBLEFORD	547	17	0	51	9.3
INNISFAIL	5,435	99	75	522	9.6
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	105	55	480	9.6
BARRHEAD	3,849	128	0	384	10.0
DIDSBURY	3,219	125	1	378	11.7
REDWATER	2,197	87	0	261	11.9
CARSTAIRS	1,725	21	48	207	12.0
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	117	0	351	12.3
LACOMBE	5,954	211	40	753	12.6
DEVON	3,931	52	119	513	13.0
BOYLE	703	23	8	93	13.2
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	66	48	342	13.2
BARNWELL	373	17	1	54	14.5
MORINVILLE	5,273	258	0	774	14.7
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	64	0	192	14.8
STETTLER	5,136	117	141	774	15.1
WHITECOURT	5,408	246	35	843	15.6
EDSON	7,110	143	266	1,227	17.2
GRANUM	399	23	0	69	17.3
ROCKYFORD	292	17	0	51	17.5
CAYLEY	232	4	10	42	18.1
MANNING	1,262	34	24	234	18.5
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	189	108	885	19.1
STONY PLAIN	5,291	213	138	1,053	19.9
OLDS	4,932	326	3	987	20.0
BRETON	534	25	11	108	20.2
ALIX	837	60	0	180	21.5
BASHAW	875	63	1	192	21.9
GIBBONS	2,620	194	0	582	22.2
FAIRVIEW	3,234	214	29	729	22.5
MANNVILLE	799	61	1	186	23.3
RIMBEY	1,906	147	2	447	23.4
STANDARD	379	30	0	90	23.7
SMOKY LAKE	1,163	84	9	279	23.9
REDCLIFF	3,814	102	217	957	25.1
SWAN HILLS	2,497	13	202	651	26.1
ATHABASCA	1,933	172	2	522	27.0
MAYERTHORPE	1,475	63	70	399	27.0
BOWDEN	983	88	1	267	27.2
FOX CREEK	1,978	180	0	540	27.3
CALMAR	1,137	101	4	315	27.7
BEISEKER	648	61	0	183	28.2
THORHILD	386	47	7	162	28.6
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	91	221	936	29.8
VEGREVILLE	5,251	550	0	1,650	31.4
COUTTS	400	19	23	126	31.5
LINDEN	461	49	0	147	31.9
VULCAN	1,507	109	56	495	32.8
VAUXHALL	492	53	1	162	32.9
HAMPA	435	54	0	162	37.2
ONOWAY	669	87	0	261	39.0
THORSBY	737	96	0	288	39.1
TWO HILLS	1,330	81	96	531	39.9
CANMORE	4,012	553	2	1,663	41.5
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	37	155	576	46.5
WARBURG	552	92	0	276	50.0
FOREMOST	617	28	75	309	50.1
STRATHMORE	3,530	368	226	1,782	50.5
HYTHE	681	117	0	351	51.5
PLAMONDON	271	10	44	162	59.8
LOMOND	204	10	36	138	67.6
CLYDE	406	93	0	279	68.7
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	71	18	267	124.8
IRVINE	360	63	108	513	142.5
TOTALS	163,615	7,398	2,974	31,116	26.8 (Avg.)

TABLE 3.a.1

RESIDENTIAL LAND ABSORPTION AT AVERAGE GROWTH RATES
CALCULATED USING AREA TIMES DENSITY AND LOTS TIMES OCCUPANCY
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	Average Yrly Pop'n Increase 1976-85	Area x Density: Potential Population Added	Area x Density: Number of Years of Growth	Lots x Occupancy: Potential Population Added	Lots x Occupancy: Number of Years of Growth
ALIX	15	71	4.8	180	12.0
ATHABASCA	22	248	11.2	522	23.5
BARNWELL	41	724	17.5	54	1.3
BARRHEAD	104	160	1.5	384	3.7
BASHAW	12	566	47.2	192	16.0
BEISEKER	19	0	0.0	183	9.7
BOWDEN	36	4,642	127.8	267	7.3
BOYLE	15	64	4.3	93	6.2
BRETON	9	24	2.6	108	11.8
BROOKS	350	1,564	4.5	747	2.1
BRUDERHEIM	84	156	1.9	576	6.9
CALMAR	30	603	19.7	315	10.3
CANMORE	236	744	3.2	1,665	7.0
CARSTAIRS	72	232	3.2	207	2.8
CAYLEY	8	17	2.0	42	4.9
CLYDE	13	94	7.2	279	21.5
CORONATION	2	573	234.3	18	7.4
COUTTS	12	46	3.7	126	10.1
DEVON	130	578	4.4	513	4.0
DIDSBURY	112	73	.6	378	3.4
DRAYTON VALLEY	80	591	7.3	480	6.0
ECKVILLE	9	38	4.3	66	7.3
EDSON	319	1,732	5.5	1,227	3.8
FAIRVIEW	112	987	8.8	729	6.5
FOREMOST	10	211	21.1	309	30.9
FORT ASSINIBOINE	4	486	136.8	267	75.1
FORT MACLEOD	17	1,745	103.3	936	55.4
FOX CREEK	40	0	0.0	540	13.5
GIBBONS	172	0	0.0	582	3.4
GRANDE CACHE	50	1,433	28.4	885	17.5
GRANUM	-4	32	-8.0	69	-17.2
HANNA	48	3,641	75.8	171	3.6
HIGH LEVEL	144	190	1.3	351	2.4
HIGH PRAIRIE	36	2,471	68.8	342	9.5
HIGH RIVER	166	141	.8	237	1.4
HYTHE	25	130	5.2	351	14.0
INNISFAIL	288	421	1.5	522	1.8
IRVINE	16	286	17.7	513	31.8
LAC LA BICHE	33	204	6.2	186	5.7
LACOMBE	233	100	.4	753	3.2
LINDEN	18	52	2.8	147	8.0
LOMOND	1	39	29.5	138	103.5
MANNING	25	594	23.6	234	9.3
MANNVILLE	18	374	20.2	186	10.0
MAYERTHORPE	51	331	6.5	399	7.8
MORINVILLE	357	805	2.2	774	2.2
NAMPA	17	42	2.5	162	9.7
NOBLEFORD	13	23	1.8	51	4.0
OLDS	147	1,460	9.9	987	6.7
ONOWAY	25	0	0.0	261	10.2
PENHOLD	93	14	.2	33	.4
PICTURE BUTTE	46	0	0.0	72	1.6
PLAMONDON	5	290	59.3	162	33.1
REDCLIFF	91	776	8.5	957	10.5
REDWATER	79	197	2.5	261	3.3
RIMBEY	38	374	9.8	447	11.7
ROCKYFORD	2	0	0.0	51	27.0
SMOKY LAKE	5	223	45.6	279	57.1
ST. PAUL	85	902	10.6	201	2.4
STANDARD	8	34	4.2	90	11.1
STETTLER	110	463	4.2	774	7.0
STONY PLAIN	287	655	2.3	1,053	3.7
STRATHMORE	220	1,781	8.1	1,782	8.1
SWAN HILLS	47	1,389	29.7	651	13.9
THORHILD	3	392	117.6	162	48.6
THORSBY	10	0	0.0	288	29.8
TURNER VALLEY	21	70	3.4	192	9.3
TWO HILLS	25	525	21.3	531	21.5
VAUXHALL	16	87	5.3	162	9.8
VEGREVILLE	128	545	4.3	1,650	13.9
VULCAN	8	336	43.2	495	63.6
WARBURG	16	77	4.8	276	17.2
WHITECOURT	180	1,139	6.4	843	4.7
TOTALS	5,321	40,053	1,477.5	31,116	1027.8

TABLE 3.4.2

RESIDENTIAL LAND ABSORPTION AT AVERAGE GROWTH RATES
CALCULATED USING AREA TIMES DENSITY AND LOTS TIMES OCCUPANCY
(ordered by years of growth capacity calculated using lot occupancy method)

Municipality	Average Yrly Pop'n Increase 1976-85	Area x Density: Potential Population Added	Area x Density: Number of Years of Growth	Lots x Occupancy: Potential Population Added	Lots x Occupancy: Number of Years of Growth
GRANUM	-4	32	-8.0	69	-17.2
PENNOLD	93	14	.2	33	.4
BARNWELL	41	724	17.5	54	1.3
HIGH RIVER	166	141	.8	237	1.4
PICTURE BUTTE	46	0	0.0	72	1.6
INNISFAIL	288	421	1.5	522	1.8
BROOKS	350	1,564	4.5	747	2.1
MORINVILLE	357	805	2.2	774	2.2
ST. PAUL	85	902	10.6	201	2.4
HIGH LEVEL	144	190	1.3	351	2.4
CARSTAIRS	72	232	3.2	207	2.8
LACOMBE	233	100	.4	753	3.2
REDWATER	79	197	2.5	261	3.3
DIDSBURY	112	73	.6	378	3.4
GIBBONS	172	0	0.0	582	3.4
HANNA	48	3,641	75.8	171	3.6
STONY PLAIN	287	655	2.3	1,053	3.7
BARRHEAD	104	160	1.5	384	3.7
EDSON	319	1,752	5.5	1,227	3.8
DEVON	130	578	4.4	513	4.0
NOBLEFORD	13	23	1.8	51	4.0
WHITECOURT	180	1,159	6.4	843	4.7
CAYLEY	8	17	2.0	42	4.9
LAC LA BICHE	33	204	6.2	186	5.7
DRAYTON VALLEY	80	591	7.3	480	6.0
BOYLE	15	64	4.3	93	6.2
FAIRVIEW	112	987	8.8	729	6.5
OLDS	147	1,460	9.9	987	6.7
BRUDERHEIM	84	156	1.9	576	6.9
STETTLER	110	463	4.2	774	7.0
CANMORE	236	744	3.2	1,665	7.0
BOWDEN	36	4,642	127.8	267	7.3
CORONATION	2	573	234.3	18	7.4
ECKVILLE	9	38	4.3	66	7.5
MAYERTHORPE	51	331	6.5	399	7.8
LINDEN	18	52	2.8	147	8.0
STRATHMORE	220	1,781	8.1	1,782	8.1
TURNER VALLEY	21	70	3.4	192	9.3
MANNING	25	594	23.6	234	9.3
HIGH PRAIRIE	36	2,471	68.8	342	9.5
NAMPA	17	42	2.5	162	9.7
BEISEKER	19	0	0.0	183	9.7
VAUXHALL	16	87	5.3	162	9.8
MANNVILLE	18	374	20.2	186	10.0
COUTTS	12	46	3.7	126	10.1
ONOWAY	25	0	0.0	261	10.2
CALMAR	30	603	19.7	315	10.3
REDCLIFF	91	776	8.5	957	10.5
STANDARD	8	34	4.2	90	11.1
RIMBEY	38	374	9.8	447	11.7
BRETON	9	24	2.6	108	11.8
ALIX	15	71	4.8	180	12.0
VEGREVILLE	128	545	4.3	1,650	12.9
FOX CREEK	40	0	0.0	540	13.5
SWAN HILLS	47	1,389	29.7	651	13.9
HYTHE	25	130	5.2	351	14.0
BASHAW	12	566	47.2	192	16.0
WARBURG	16	77	4.8	276	17.2
GRANDE CACHE	50	1,433	28.4	883	17.5
CLYDE	13	94	7.2	279	21.5
TWO HILLS	25	525	21.3	531	21.5
ATHABASCA	22	248	11.2	522	23.5
ROCKYFORD	2	0	0.0	51	27.0
THORSBY	10	0	0.0	288	29.8
FOREMOST	10	211	21.1	309	30.9
IRVINE	16	286	17.7	513	31.8
PLAMONDON	5	290	59.3	162	33.1
THORHILD	3	392	117.6	162	48.6
FORT MACLEOD	17	1,745	103.3	936	55.4
SMOKY LAKE	5	223	45.6	279	57.1
VULCAN	8	336	43.2	495	63.6
FORT ASSINIBOINE	4	486	136.8	267	75.1
LOMOND	1	39	29.5	138	103.5
TOTALS	5,321	40,053	1,477.5	31,116	1027.8

TABLE 3.5.1

RESIDENTIAL LAND ABSORPTION AT RAPID GROWTH RATES
CALCULATED USING AREA TIMES DENSITY AND LOTS TIMES OCCUPANCY
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	Average Yrly Pop'n Increase 1976-82	Area x Density: Potential Population Added	Area x Density: Number of Years of Growth	Lots x Occupancy: Potential Population Added	Lots x Occupancy: Number of Years of Growth
ALIX	22	71	3.2	180	8.0
BARNWELL	60	724	12.1	54	.9
BARRHEAD	137	160	1.2	384	2.8
BASHAW	18	566	31.4	192	10.7
BEISEKER	26	0	0.0	183	6.9
BOWDEN	61	4,642	76.3	267	4.4
BOYLE	17	64	3.8	93	5.5
BRETON	19	24	1.3	108	5.7
BROOKS	525	1,564	3.0	747	1.4
BRUDERHEIM	126	156	1.2	576	4.6
CALNAR	33	603	18.2	315	9.5
CANMORE	300	744	2.5	1,665	5.5
CARSTAIRS	109	232	2.1	207	1.9
CAYLEY	6	17	2.7	42	6.5
CLYDE	12	94	7.5	279	22.3
CORONATION	4	573	136.2	18	4.9
COUTTS	19	46	2.5	126	6.7
DEVON	194	578	3.0	513	2.6
DIDSBURY	174	73	.4	378	2.2
DRAYTON VALLEY	102	591	5.8	480	4.7
ECKVILLE	18	38	2.1	66	3.6
EDSON	342	1,752	5.1	1,227	3.6
FAIRVIEW	107	987	9.2	729	6.8
FOREMOST	8	211	25.9	309	37.8
FORT ASSINIBOINE	2	486	324.3	267	178.0
FORT MACLEOD	25	1,745	68.9	936	36.9
FOX CREEK	60	0	0.0	540	9.0
GIBBONS	253	0	0.0	582	2.3
GRANDE CACHE	76	1,433	18.9	885	11.7
HANNA	37	3,641	97.5	171	4.6
HIGH LEVEL	134	190	1.4	351	2.6
HIGH PRAIRIE	42	2,471	59.3	342	8.2
HIGH RIVER	221	141	.6	237	1.1
HYTHE	38	130	3.5	351	9.4
INNISFAIL	434	421	1.0	522	1.2
IRVINE	24	286	11.8	513	21.2
LAC LA BICHE	20	204	10.1	186	9.2
LACOMBE	311	100	.3	753	2.4
LINDEN	22	52	2.4	147	6.7
LOMOND	2	39	19.7	138	69.0
MANNING	38	594	15.8	234	6.2
MANNVILLE	26	374	14.4	186	7.2
MAYERTHORPE	77	331	4.3	399	5.2
MORINVILLE	481	805	1.7	774	1.6
NAMPA	8	42	5.2	162	19.8
NOBLEFORD	20	23	1.1	51	2.5
OLDS	214	1,460	6.8	987	4.6
ONOWAY	38	0	0.0	261	6.8
PENHOLD	128	14	.1	33	.2
PICTURE BUTTE	43	0	0.0	72	1.7
PLAMONDON	7	290	39.5	162	22.1
REDCLIFF	137	776	5.6	957	7.0
REDWATER	115	197	1.7	261	2.3
RIMBEY	53	374	7.1	447	8.4
ROCKYFORD	9	0	0.0	51	5.7
SMOKY LAKE	7	223	30.4	279	38.0
ST. PAUL	100	902	9.1	201	2.0
STANDARD	12	34	2.8	90	7.4
STETTLER	166	463	2.8	774	4.7
STONY PLAIN	400	653	1.6	1,053	2.6
STRATHMORE	275	1,781	6.5	1,782	6.5
SWAN HILLS	70	1,389	19.8	651	9.3
THORNILD	5	392	78.4	162	32.4
THORSBY	14	0	0.0	288	19.9
TURNER VALLEY	38	70	1.8	192	5.1
TWO HILLS	37	523	14.2	531	14.4
VAUXHALL	25	87	3.5	162	6.6
VEGREVILLE	192	545	2.8	1,650	8.6
VULCAN	6	336	54.6	495	80.3
WARBURG	22	77	3.5	276	12.4
WHITECOURT	270	1,139	4.3	843	3.1
TOTALS	7,171	39,774	1,336.2	30,525	898.0

TABLE 3.3.2

RESIDENTIAL LAND ABSORPTION AT RAPID GROWTH RATES
CALCULATED USING AREA TIMES DENSITY AND LOTS TIMES OCCUPANCY
(ordered by years of growth capacity calculated using lot occupancy method)

Municipality	Average Yrly Pop'n Increase 1976-82	Area x Density: Potential Population Added	Area x Density: Number of Years of Growth	Lots x Occupancy: Potential Population Added	Lots x Occupancy: Number of Years of Growth
PENHOLD	128	14	.1	33	.2
BARNWELL	60	724	12.1	54	.9
HIGH RIVER	221	141	.6	237	1.1
INNISFAIL	434	421	1.0	522	1.2
BROOKS	525	1,564	3.0	747	1.4
MORINVILLE	481	803	1.7	774	1.6
PICTURE BUTTE	43	0	0.0	72	1.7
CARSTAIRS	109	232	2.1	207	1.9
ST. PAUL	100	902	9.1	201	2.0
DIDSBURY	174	73	.4	378	2.2
REDWATER	115	197	1.7	261	2.3
GIBBONS	253	0	0.0	582	2.3
LACOMBE	311	100	.3	753	2.4
NOBLEFORD	20	23	1.1	51	2.5
HIGH LEVEL	134	190	1.4	351	2.6
STONY PLAIN	400	655	1.6	1,053	2.6
DEVON	194	578	3.0	513	2.6
BARRHEAD	137	160	1.2	384	2.8
WHITECOURT	270	1,159	4.3	843	3.1
EDSON	343	1,752	5.1	1,227	3.6
ECKVILLE	18	38	2.1	66	3.6
BOWDEN	61	4,642	76.3	267	4.4
BRUDERHEIM	126	156	1.2	576	4.6
HANNA	37	3,641	97.5	171	4.6
OLDS	214	1,460	6.8	987	4.6
STETTLER	166	463	2.8	774	4.7
DRAYTON VALLEY	102	591	5.8	480	4.7
CORONATION	4	573	136.2	18	4.9
TURNER VALLEY	38	70	1.8	192	5.1
MAYERTHORPE	77	331	4.3	399	5.2
BOYLE	17	64	3.8	93	5.5
CANMORE	300	744	2.5	1,665	5.5
ROCKYFORD	9	0	0.0	51	5.7
BRETON	19	24	1.3	108	5.7
MANNING	38	594	15.8	234	6.2
CAYLEY	6	17	2.7	42	6.5
STRATHMORE	275	1,781	6.5	1,782	6.5
VAUXHALL	25	87	3.5	162	6.4
LINDEN	22	52	2.4	147	6.7
COUTTS	19	46	2.5	126	6.7
FAIRVIEW	107	987	9.2	729	6.8
ONOWAY	38	0	0.0	261	6.8
BEISEKER	26	0	0.0	183	6.9
REDCLIFF	137	776	5.6	957	7.0
MANNVILLE	26	374	14.4	186	7.1
STANDARD	12	34	2.8	90	7.4
ALIX	22	71	3.2	180	8.0
HIGH PRAIRIE	42	2,471	59.5	342	8.2
RIMBEY	53	374	7.1	447	8.4
VEGREVILLE	192	345	2.8	1,650	8.6
FOX CREEK	60	0	0.0	540	9.0
LAC LA BICHE	20	204	10.1	186	9.2
SWAN HILLS	70	1,389	19.8	651	9.3
HYTHE	38	130	3.5	351	9.4
CALMAR	33	603	18.2	315	9.5
BARRHAW	18	566	31.4	192	10.7
GRANDE CACHE	76	1,433	18.9	883	11.7
WARBURG	22	77	3.5	276	12.4
TWO HILLS	37	525	14.2	531	14.4
NAMPA	8	42	5.2	162	19.8
THORSBY	14	0	0.0	288	19.9
IRVINE	24	286	11.8	513	21.3
PLAMONDON	7	290	39.5	162	22.1
CLYDE	12	94	7.5	279	23.3
THORHILD	3	392	78.4	162	32.4
FORT MACLEOD	25	1,745	68.9	936	36.9
FOREMOST	8	211	25.9	309	37.8
SMOKY LAKE	7	223	30.4	279	38.0
LOMOND	2	39	19.7	138	69.0
VULCAN	6	336	54.8	495	80.3
FORT ASSINIBOINE	2	486	324.3	267	178.0
TOTALS	7,171	39,774	1,336.3	30,325	898.0

TABLE 3.6.1

RESIDENTIAL LAND ABSORPTION AT SLOW GROWTH RATES
CALCULATED USING AREA TIMES DENSITY AND LOTS TIMES OCCUPANCY
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	Average Yrly Pop'n Increase 1982-85	Area x Density: Potential Population Added	Area x Density: Number of Years of Growth	Lots x Occupancy: Potential Population Added	Lots x Occupancy: Number of Years of Growth
ATHABASCA	67	248	3.7	522	7.8
BARNWELL	5	724	155.2	54	11.6
BARRHEAD	38	160	4.2	384	10.2
BEISEKER	4	0	0.0	183	49.9
BOYLE	13	44	3.5	93	8.0
CALMAR	25	603	23.8	315	12.4
CANMORE	108	744	6.9	1,663	15.3
CAYLEY	13	17	1.4	42	3.3
CLYDE	14	94	6.7	279	19.9
DRAYTON VALLEY	38	591	15.4	480	12.5
EDSON	273	1,752	6.4	1,227	4.5
FAIRVIEW	132	987	8.1	729	6.0
FOREMOST	14	211	15.5	309	22.6
FORT ASSINIBOINE	8	486	63.4	267	34.8
GIBBONS	9	0	0.0	582	62.4
HANNA	69	3,641	52.5	171	2.5
HIGH LEVEL	166	190	1.1	351	2.1
HIGH PRAIRIE	25	2,471	100.2	342	13.9
HIGH RIVER	58	141	2.4	337	6.1
LAC LA BICHE	58	204	3.5	186	3.2
LACOMBE	77	100	1.3	753	9.8
LINDEN	12	52	4.4	147	13.6
MANNVILLE	4	374	102.1	186	50.7
MORINVILLE	110	805	7.3	774	7.0
NAMPA	34	42	1.2	162	4.8
OLDS	13	1,460	99.8	987	67.3
PENNHOLD	23	14	.6	33	1.4
PICTURE BUTTE	53	0	0.0	73	1.4
REDWATER	8	197	25.7	261	34.0
RIMBEY	9	374	43.2	467	51.8
ST. PAUL	56	902	16.1	201	3.6
STONY PLAIN	62	655	10.6	1,053	17.0
STRATHMORE	110	1,781	16.1	1,782	16.2
VULCAN	11	336	30.6	495	45.0
WARBURG	4	77	21.0	276	75.3
TOTALS	1,710	20,301	856.1	14,047	706.8

TABLE 3.6.2

RESIDENTIAL LAND ABSORPTION AT SLOW GROWTH RATES
CALCULATED USING AREA TIMES DENSITY AND LOTS TIMES OCCUPANCY
(ordered by years of growth capacity calculated using lot occupancy method)

Municipality	Average Yrly Pop'n Increase 1982-85	Area x Density: Potential Population Added	Area x Density: Number of Years of Growth	Lots x Occupancy: Potential Population Added	Lots x Occupancy: Number of Years of Growth
PICTURE BUTTE	53	0	0.0	72	1.4
PENHOLD	23	14	.6	33	1.4
HIGH LEVEL	166	190	1.1	351	2.1
HANNA	69	3,841	55.3	171	2.5
LAC LA BICHE	58	204	3.5	186	3.2
CAYLEY	13	17	1.4	42	3.3
ST. PAUL	56	902	16.1	201	3.6
HIGH RIVER	58	141	2.4	237	4.1
EDSON	273	1,752	6.4	1,227	4.5
NAMPA	34	42	1.2	162	4.8
FAIRVIEW	122	987	8.1	729	6.0
MORINVILLE	110	805	7.3	774	7.0
ATHABASCA	67	268	3.7	522	7.8
BOYLE	12	64	5.5	93	8.0
LACOMBE	77	100	1.3	753	9.8
BARRHEAD	38	160	4.2	384	10.2
BARNWELL	3	734	133.2	54	11.4
CALMAR	23	603	23.8	315	12.4
DRAYTON VALLEY	58	591	15.4	480	12.5
LINDEN	13	52	4.4	147	12.6
HIGH PRAIRIE	29	2,471	100.2	342	13.9
CANMORE	108	744	6.9	1,445	13.3
STRATHMORE	110	1,781	16.1	1,782	16.2
STONY PLAIN	62	653	10.6	1,053	17.0
CLYDE	14	94	6.7	279	19.9
FOREMOST	14	311	13.5	309	22.4
REDWATER	8	197	25.7	261	34.0
FORT ASSINIBOINE	6	486	83.4	267	34.8
VULCAN	11	338	30.6	493	45.0
BEISEKER	4	0	0.0	183	49.9
MANNVILLE	4	374	102.1	186	50.7
RIMBEY	9	374	43.2	447	51.6
GIBBONS	8	0	0.0	582	83.4
OLDS	15	1,488	99.6	987	67.3
WARBURG	4	77	21.0	274	79.3
TOTALS	1,710	20,301	858.1	18,047	704.8

TABLE 5.7.1

VACANT COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL LAND
AS A PERCENTAGE OF AREA DESIGNATED
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	Vac Com Area as % of Designated Com'l Land	Vac Ind Area as % of Designated Ind'l Land
ALIX	5.5	35.7
ATHABASCA	1.0	18.4
BARNWELL	0.0	0.0
BARRHEAD	5.8	35.6
BASHAW	7.7	57.7
BEISEKER	0.0	0.0
BOWDEN	2.6	25.5
BOYLE	5.8	0.0
BRETON	38.7	0.0
BROOKS	16.0	13.0
BRUDERHEIM	6.8	253.6
CALMAR	5.7	66.1
CANMORE	58.8	0.0
CARSTAIRS	25.1	51.3
CAYLEY	0.0	0.0
CLYDE	43.5	85.8
CORONATION	8.6	9.2
COUTTS	23.4	8.2
DEVON	23.6	37.3
DIDSBURY	0.0	0.0
DRAYTON VALLEY	24.9	7.3
ECKVILLE	0.0	0.0
EDSON	20.8	4.9
FAIRVIEW	26.4	18.6
FOREMOST	15.2	7.7
FORT ASSINIBOINE	23.1	0.0
FORT MACLEOD	44.9	37.6
FOX CREEK	0.0	0.0
GIBBONS	0.0	0.0
GRANDE CACHE	9.9	33.5
GRANUM	11.2	10.5
HANNA	.7	7.5
HIGH LEVEL	11.9	10.7
HIGH PRAIRIE	42.1	28.3
HIGH RIVER	1.8	2.6
HYTHE	7.8	8.3
INNISFAIL	10.6	40.7
IRVINE	81.6	16.0
LAC LA BICHE	0.0	12.0
LACOMBE	0.0	34.8
LINDEN	14.6	3.6
LONOMD	31.6	1.6
MANNING	0.0	24.7
MANNVILLE	51.6	44.6
MAYERTHORPE	26.6	34.2
MORINVILLE	30.7	41.8
NAMPA	6.0	7.3
NOBLEFORD	3.0	17.3
OLDS	10.8	37.0
ONOWAY	0.0	28.1
PENNOLD	26.9	16.2
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	0.0
PLAMONDON	63.6	0.0
REDCLIFF	21.6	14.5
REDWATER	1.2	17.9
RIMBEY	18.6	40.7
ROCKYFORD	0.0	33.1
SMOKY LAKE	35.9	13.5
ST. PAUL	14.7	36.5
STANDARD	0.0	10.0
STETTLER	18.6	37.6
STONY PLAIN	24.2	20.6
STRATHMORE	36.6	31.7
SWAN HILLS	24.6	19.0
THORHILD	6.0	16.3
THORSBY	0.0	0.0
TURNER VALLEY	3.7	25.0
TWO HILLS	49.6	50.8
VAUXHALL	49.1	3.3
VEGREVILLE	5.7	35.1
VULCAN	13.5	70.0
WARBURG	13.2	25.6
WHITECOURT	12.7	3.6
AVERAGE	16.5	24.6

VACANT COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL LAND
AS A PERCENTAGE OF AREA DESIGNATED
(ordered by vacant commercial land percentage)

Municipality	Vac Com Area as % of Designated Com'l Land	Vac Ind Area as % of Designated Ind'l Land
BARNWELL	0.0	0.0
BRISEBOIS	0.0	0.0
CAYLEY	0.0	0.0
DIDSBURY	0.0	0.0
ECKVILLE	0.0	0.0
FOX CREEK	0.0	0.0
GIBBONS	0.0	0.0
LAC LA BICHE	0.0	11.0
LACOMBE	0.0	34.8
MANNING	0.0	28.7
ONOWAY	0.0	26.1
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	0.0
ROCKYFORD	0.0	33.1
STANDARD	0.0	16.0
THORSBY	0.0	0.0
HANNA	.7	7.3
ATHABASCA	1.0	16.4
REDWATER	1.3	17.9
HIGH RIVER	1.8	2.4
BOWDEN	2.6	25.5
NOBLEFORD	3.0	17.3
TURNER VALLEY	3.7	25.0
THORNILD	4.0	18.3
ALIX	5.5	35.7
VEGREVILLE	5.7	33.1
CALMAR	5.7	66.1
BOYLE	5.8	0.0
BARRHEAD	5.8	35.6
HAMPA	6.0	7.1
BRUDERHEIM	6.8	233.6
BASHAW	7.7	57.7
BLYTHE	7.8	8.2
CORONATION	8.6	9.2
GRANDE CACHE	9.9	32.5
INNISFAIL	10.4	40.7
OLDS	10.8	37.0
GRANUM	11.1	10.9
HIGH LEVEL	11.9	10.7
WHITECOURT	12.7	5.4
WARBURG	13.2	25.4
VULCAN	13.5	70.0
LINDEN	14.6	3.0
ST. PAUL	14.9	36.1
FOREMOST	15.2	7.7
BROOKS	16.0	13.0
STETTLER	18.4	47.4
RIMBEY	18.6	40.7
EDSON	20.8	4.9
REDCLIFF	21.4	14.3
FORT ASSINIBOINE	23.1	0.0
COUTTS	23.4	8.2
DEVON	23.6	37.3
STONY PLAIN	24.2	24.4
SWAN HILLS	24.6	19.0
BRAYTON VALLEY	24.9	7.3
CARSTAIRS	25.1	31.3
FAIRVIEW	26.4	18.6
WATERTHORPE	28.6	34.2
PENHOLD	28.9	18.2
MORINVILLE	30.7	41.8
LOMOND	32.4	1.6
SMOKY LAKE	33.9	15.5
STRATHMORE	36.4	31.7
BRETON	38.7	0.0
HIGH PRAIRIE	42.1	28.3
PLAMONDON	43.4	0.0
CLYDE	43.5	85.8
FORT MACLEOD	44.9	37.6
VAUXHALL	49.1	3.3
TWO HILLS	49.4	30.8
MANNVILLE	51.6	44.6
CANMORE	58.8	0.0
IRVINE	61.4	16.0
AVERAGE	16.3	24.6

TABLE 3.7.3

VACANT COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL LAND
AS A PERCENTAGE OF AREA DESIGNATED
(ordered by vacant industrial land percentage)

Municipality	Vac Com Area as % of Designated Com'l Land	Vac Ind Area as % of Designtated Ind'l Land
BARNWELL	0.0	0.0
BEISEKER	0.0	0.0
BOYLE	5.8	0.0
BRETON	38.7	0.0
CANMORE	58.8	0.0
CAYLEY	0.0	0.0
DIDSBURY	0.0	0.0
ECKVILLE	0.0	0.0
FORT ASSINIBOINE	23.1	0.0
FOX CREEK	0.0	0.0
GIBBONS	0.0	0.0
PICTURE BUTTE	0.0	0.0
PLAMONDON	43.4	0.0
THORSBY	0.0	0.0
LOMOND	32.4	1.6
HIGH RIVER	1.8	2.4
VAUXHALL	49.1	3.3
LINDEN	14.6	3.6
EDSON	20.8	4.9
WHITECOURT	12.7	5.4
NAMPA	6.0	7.2
DRAYTON VALLEY	24.9	7.3
HANNA	.7	7.5
FOREMOST	15.2	7.7
HYTHE	7.8	8.2
COUTTS	23.4	8.2
CORONATION	8.6	9.2
GRANUM	11.2	10.5
HIGH LEVEL	11.9	10.7
LAC LA BICHE	0.0	12.0
BROOKS	16.0	13.0
REDCLIFF	21.4	14.5
SMOKY LAKE	35.9	15.5
IRVINE	81.4	16.0
STANDARD	0.0	16.0
PENHOLD	26.9	16.2
THORHILD	4.0	16.3
ATHABASCA	1.0	16.4
NOBLEFORD	3.0	17.3
REDWATER	1.2	17.9
FAIRVIEW	26.4	18.6
SWAN HILLS	24.6	19.0
STONY PLAIN	24.2	24.4
TURNER VALLEY	3.7	25.0
WARBURG	13.2	25.4
BOWDEN	2.6	25.5
ONOWAY	0.0	26.1
MANNING	0.0	26.7
HIGH PRAIRIE	42.1	28.3
CARSTAIRS	25.1	31.3
STRATHMORE	36.4	31.7
GRANDE CACHE	9.9	32.5
ROCKYFORD	0.0	33.1
MAYERTHORPE	26.6	34.2
ST. PAUL	14.7	34.5
LACOMBE	0.0	34.8
BARRHEAD	5.8	35.6
ALIX	5.5	35.7
OLDS	10.8	37.0
DEVON	23.6	37.3
STETTLER	18.4	37.4
FORT MACLEOD	44.9	37.6
INNISFAIL	10.4	40.7
RIMBEY	18.4	40.7
MORINVILLE	30.7	41.8
MANNVILLE	31.6	44.6
TWO HILLS	49.4	50.8
VEGREVILLE	5.7	55.1
BASHAW	7.7	57.7
CALMAR	5.7	66.1
VULCAN	13.5	70.0
CLYDE	43.5	85.8
BRUDERHEIM	6.8	253.6
AVERAGE	16.5	24.6

TABLE 4.1.1

WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Add'l Pop'n if Vacant & Dev'g Lots Occupied	Water Supply Capacity: Design Pop'n	Am't left for Add'l Pop Growth	Am't left if all Vac Lots Occ'd
ALIX	837	180	1,500	663	483
ATHABASCA	1,933	522	5,000	3,067	2,545
BARNWELL	373	54	800	427	373
BARRHEAD	3,849	384	5,800	1,951	1,567
BASHAW	875	192	3,500	2,625	2,433
BEISEKER	648	183	1,000	352	169
BOWDEN	983	267	2,500	1,517	1,250
BOYLE	703	93	670	-33	-126
BRETON	534	108	1,500	966	858
BROOKS	9,421	747	16,000	6,579	5,832
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	576	15,000	13,762	13,186
CALMAR	1,137	315	5,000	3,863	3,548
CANMORE	4,012	1,665	10,000	5,988	4,323
CARSTAIRS	1,725	207	7,200	5,475	5,268
CAYLEY	232	42	300	268	226
CLYDE	406	279	1,500	1,094	815
CORONATION	1,268	18	2,000	732	714
COUTTS	400	126	600	200	74
DEVON	3,931	513	5,000	1,069	556
DIDSBURY	3,219	378	5,000	1,781	1,403
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	480	8,000	3,018	2,538
ECKVILLE	842	66	1,000	158	92
EDSON	7,110	1,227	7,500	390	-837
FAIRVIEW	3,234	729	7,500	4,266	3,537
FOREMOST	617	309	800	183	-126
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	267	1,200	986	719
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	936	5,000	1,861	925
FOX CREEK	1,978	540	3,500	1,522	982
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	885	10,000	5,376	4,491
GRANUM	399	69	1,000	601	532
HANNA	3,036	171	5,000	1,964	1,793
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	351	3,500	648	297
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	342	4,000	1,420	1,078
HIGH RIVER	5,114	237	12,000	6,886	6,649
HYTHE	681	351	1,000	319	-32
INNISFAIL	5,435	522	10,000	4,565	4,043
IRVINE	360	513	600	240	-273
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	186	5,000	2,758	2,572
LACOMBE	5,954	753	13,000	7,046	6,293
LINDEN	461	147	1,500	1,039	892
LOMOND	204	138	500	296	158
MANNING	1,262	234	3,000	1,738	1,504
MANNVILLE	799	186	1,200	401	215
MORINVILLE	5,273	774	25,000	19,727	18,953
NAMPA	435	162	2,500	2,065	1,903
NOBLEFORD	547	51	600	53	2
OLDS	4,932	987	12,000	7,068	6,081
ONOWAY	669	261	1,500	831	570
PENHOLD	1,588	33	2,000	412	379
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	72	2,500	938	866
PLAMONDON	271	162	1,000	729	567
REDWATER	2,197	264	8,000	5,803	5,539
RIMBEY	1,906	447	2,000	94	-353
ROCKYFORD	292	51	800	508	457
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	279	1,500	335	56
ST. PAUL	5,052	201	6,000	948	747
STANDARD	379	90	600	221	131
STETTLER	5,136	774	7,500	2,364	1,590
STRATHMORE	3,530	1,782	12,000	8,470	6,688
SWAN HILLS	2,497	651	5,500	3,003	2,352
THORHILD	566	162	1,200	634	472
THORSBY	737	288	1,500	763	475
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	192	2,000	702	510
TWO HILLS	1,330	531	1,500	170	-361
VULCAN	1,507	495	3,000	1,493	998
WARBURG	352	276	1,500	948	672
WHITECOURT	5,408	843	8,000	2,592	1,749
TOTALS	144,672	26,316	305,570	160,898	134,582

TABLE 4.1.2

WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS
(ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Add'l Pop'n if Vacant & Dev'g Lots Occupied	Water Supply Capacity: Design Pop'n	Am't left for Add'l Pop Growth	Am't left if all Vac Lots Occ'd
EDSON	7,110	1,227	7,500	390	-837
TWO HILLS	1,330	531	1,500	170	-361
RIMBEY	1,906	447	2,000	94	-353
IRVINE	360	513	600	240	-273
BOYLE	703	93	670	-33	-126
FOREMOST	617	309	800	183	-126
HYTHE	681	351	1,000	319	-32
NOBLEFORD	547	51	600	53	2
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	279	1,500	335	56
COUTTS	400	126	600	200	74
ECKVILLE	842	66	1,000	158	92
STANDARD	379	90	600	221	131
LOMOND	204	138	500	296	158
BEISEKER	648	183	1,000	352	169
MANNVILLE	799	186	1,200	401	215
CAYLEY	232	42	500	268	226
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	351	3,500	648	297
BARNWELL	373	54	800	427	373
PENHOLD	1,588	33	2,000	412	379
ROCKYFORD	292	51	800	508	457
THORHILD	566	162	1,200	634	472
THORSBY	737	288	1,500	763	475
ALIX	837	180	1,500	663	483
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	192	2,000	702	510
GRANUM	399	69	1,000	601	532
DEVON	3,931	513	5,000	1,069	556
PLAMONDON	271	162	1,000	729	567
ONOWAY	669	261	1,500	831	570
WARBURG	552	276	1,500	948	672
CORONATION	1,268	18	2,000	732	714
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	267	1,200	986	719
ST. PAUL	5,052	201	6,000	948	747
CLYDE	406	279	1,500	1,094	815
BRETON	534	108	1,500	966	858
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	72	2,500	938	866
LINDEN	461	147	1,500	1,039	892
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	936	5,000	1,861	925
FOX CREEK	1,978	540	3,500	1,522	982
VULCAN	1,507	495	3,000	1,493	998
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	342	4,000	1,420	1,078
BOWDEN	983	267	2,500	1,517	1,250
DIDSBURY	3,219	378	5,000	1,781	1,403
MANNING	1,262	234	3,000	1,738	1,504
BARRHEAD	3,849	384	5,800	1,951	1,567
STETTLER	5,136	774	7,500	2,364	1,590
WHITECOURT	5,408	843	8,000	2,592	1,749
HANNA	3,036	171	5,000	1,964	1,793
NAMPA	435	162	2,500	2,065	1,903
SWAN HILLS	2,497	651	5,500	3,003	2,352
BASHAW	875	192	3,500	2,625	2,433
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	480	8,000	3,018	2,538
ATHABASCA	1,933	522	5,000	3,067	2,545
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	186	5,000	2,758	2,572
FAIRVIEW	3,234	729	7,500	4,266	3,537
CALMAR	1,137	315	5,000	3,863	3,548
INNISFAIL	5,435	522	10,000	4,565	4,043
CANMORE	4,012	1,665	10,000	5,988	4,323
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	885	10,000	5,376	4,491
CARSTAIRS	1,725	207	7,200	5,475	5,268
REDWATER	2,197	264	8,000	5,803	5,539
BROOKS	9,421	747	16,000	6,579	5,832
OLDS	4,932	987	12,000	7,068	6,081
LACOMBE	5,954	753	13,000	7,046	6,293
HIGH RIVER	5,114	237	12,000	6,886	6,649
STRATHMORE	3,530	1,782	12,000	8,470	6,688
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	576	15,000	13,762	13,186
MORINVILLE	5,273	774	25,000	19,727	18,953
TOTALS	144,672	26,316	305,570	160,898	134,582

TABLE 4.2.1

WATER TRUNK SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Add'l Pop'n if Vacant & Dev'g Lots Occupied	Water Trunk Capacity: Design Pop'n	Am't left for Add'l Pop Growth	Am't left if all Vac Lots Occ'd
ALIX	837	180	1,500	663	483
ATHABASCA	1,933	522	4,500	2,567	2,045
BARNWELL	373	54	800	427	373
BARRHEAD	3,849	384	5,800	1,951	1,567
BASHAW	875	192	1,500	625	433
BEISEKER	648	183	1,000	352	169
BOWDEN	983	267	1,500	517	250
BRETON	534	108	1,500	966	858
BROOKS	9,421	747	10,000	579	-168
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	576	3,000	1,762	1,186
CANMORE	4,012	1,665	16,000	11,988	10,323
CARSTAIRS	1,725	207	5,000	3,275	3,068
CAYLEY	232	42	500	268	226
CLYDE	406	279	1,500	1,094	815
CORONATION	1,268	18	2,000	732	714
COUTTS	400	126	600	200	74
DEVON	3,931	513	5,000	1,069	556
DIDSBURY	3,219	378	5,000	1,781	1,403
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	480	8,000	3,018	2,538
ECKVILLE	842	66	1,000	158	92
EDSON	7,110	1,227	7,500	390	-837
FAIRVIEW	3,234	729	4,000	766	37
FOREMOST	617	309	800	183	-126
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	267	1,200	986	719
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	936	4,000	861	-75
FOX CREEK	1,978	540	3,500	1,522	982
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	885	6,500	1,876	991
GRANUM	399	69	1,000	601	532
HANNA	3,036	171	5,000	1,964	1,793
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	351	5,000	2,148	1,797
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	342	3,000	420	78
HIGH RIVER	5,114	237	6,000	886	649
HYTHE	681	351	350	-331	-682
INNISFAIL	5,435	522	10,000	4,565	4,043
IRVINE	360	513	1,500	1,140	627
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	186	2,500	258	72
LACOMBE	5,954	753	13,000	7,046	6,293
LINDEN	461	147	1,000	539	392
MANNING	1,262	234	3,000	1,738	1,504
MANNVILLE	799	186	1,200	401	215
MORINVILLE	5,273	774	25,000	19,727	18,953
NAMPA	435	162	500	65	-97
NOBLEFORD	547	51	600	53	2
OLDS	4,932	987	5,000	68	-919
ONOWAY	669	261	1,500	831	570
PENHOLD	1,588	33	2,000	412	379
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	72	2,500	938	866
REDWATER	2,197	264	8,000	5,803	5,539
RIMBEY	1,906	447	2,800	894	447
ROCKYFORD	292	51	800	508	457
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	279	1,500	335	56
ST. PAUL	5,052	201	10,000	4,948	4,747
STANDARD	379	90	600	221	131
STETTLER	5,136	774	10,000	4,864	4,090
STRATHMORE	3,530	1,782	5,000	1,470	-312
SWAN HILLS	2,497	651	3,000	503	-148
THORNILD	566	162	1,000	434	272
THORSBY	737	288	1,500	763	475
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	192	2,000	702	510
TWO HILLS	1,330	531	1,500	170	-361
VULCAN	1,507	495	3,000	1,493	998
WARBURG	552	276	1,000	448	172
WHITECOURT	5,408	843	12,000	6,592	5,749
TOTALS	142,357	25,608	256,550	114,193	88,585

TABLE 4.2.2

WATER TRUNK SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS
(ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Add'l Pop'n if Vacant & Dev'g Lots Occupied	Water Trunk Capacity: Design Pop'n	Am't left for Add'l Pop Growth	Am't left if all Vac Lots Occ'd
OLDS	4,932	987	5,000	68	-919
EDSON	7,110	1,227	7,500	390	-837
MYTHE	681	351	350	-331	-682
TWO HILLS	1,330	531	1,500	170	-361
STRATHMORE	3,530	1,782	5,000	1,470	-312
BROOKS	9,421	747	10,000	579	-168
SWAN HILLS	2,497	651	3,000	503	-148
FOREMOST	617	309	800	183	-126
NAMPA	435	162	500	65	-97
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	936	4,000	861	-75
NOBLEFORD	547	51	600	53	2
FAIRVIEW	3,234	729	4,000	766	37
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	279	1,500	335	56
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	186	2,500	258	72
COUTTS	400	126	600	200	74
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	342	3,000	420	78
ECKVILLE	842	66	1,000	158	92
STANDARD	379	90	600	221	131
BEISEKER	648	183	1,000	352	169
WARBURG	552	276	1,000	448	172
MANNVILLE	799	186	1,200	401	215
CAYLEY	232	42	500	268	226
BOWDEN	983	267	1,500	517	250
THORHILD	566	162	1,000	434	272
BARNWELL	373	54	800	427	373
PENHOLD	1,588	33	2,000	412	379
LINDEN	461	147	1,000	539	392
BASHAW	875	192	1,500	625	433
RIMBEY	1,906	447	2,800	894	447
ROCKYFORD	292	51	800	508	457
THORSBY	737	288	1,500	763	475
ALIX	837	180	1,500	663	483
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	192	2,000	702	510
GRANUM	399	69	1,000	601	532
DEVON	3,931	513	5,000	1,069	556
ONOWAY	669	261	1,500	831	570
IRVINE	360	513	1,500	1,140	627
HIGH RIVER	5,114	237	6,000	886	649
CORONATION	1,268	18	2,000	732	714
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	267	1,200	986	719
CLYDE	406	279	1,500	1,094	815
BRETON	534	108	1,500	966	858
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	72	2,500	938	866
FOX CREEK	1,978	540	3,500	1,522	982
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	885	6,500	1,876	991
VULCAN	1,507	495	3,000	1,493	998
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	576	3,000	1,762	1,186
DIDSBURY	3,219	378	5,000	1,781	1,403
MANNING	1,262	234	3,000	1,738	1,504
BARRHEAD	3,849	384	5,800	1,951	1,567
HANNA	3,036	171	5,000	1,964	1,793
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	351	5,000	2,148	1,797
ATHABASCA	1,933	522	4,500	2,567	2,045
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	480	8,000	3,018	2,538
CARSTAIRS	1,725	207	5,000	3,275	3,068
INNISFAIL	5,435	522	10,000	4,565	4,043
STETTLER	5,136	774	10,000	4,864	4,090
ST. PAUL	5,052	201	10,000	4,948	4,747
REDWATER	2,197	264	8,000	5,803	5,539
WHITECOURT	5,408	843	12,000	6,592	5,749
LACOMBE	5,954	753	13,000	7,046	6,293
CANMORE	4,012	1,665	16,000	11,988	10,323
MORINVILLE	5,273	774	25,000	19,727	18,953
TOTALS	142,357	25,608	256,550	114,193	88,585

TABLE 4.3.1

SEWAGE TREATMENT SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Add'l Pop'n if Vacant & Dev'g Lots Occupied	Sewer Treatment Capacity: Design Pop'n	Am't left for Add'l Pop Growth	Am't left if all Vac Lots Occ'd
ALIX	837	180	1,500	663	483
ATHABASCA	1,933	522	4,500	2,567	2,045
BARNWELL	373	54	800	427	373
BARRHEAD	3,849	384	20,000	16,151	15,767
BASHAW	875	192	3,500	2,625	2,433
BEISEKER	648	183	600	-48	-231
BOWDEN	983	267	2,000	1,017	750
BOYLE	703	93	1,000	297	204
BRETON	534	108	1,200	666	558
BROOKS	9,421	747	16,000	6,579	5,832
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	576	8,000	6,762	6,186
CALMAR	1,137	315	1,120	-17	-332
CANMORE	4,012	1,665	12,000	7,988	6,323
CARSTAIRS	1,725	207	5,000	3,275	3,068
CAYLEY	232	42	250	18	-24
CLYDE	406	279	1,500	1,094	815
CORONATION	1,268	18	1,500	232	214
COUTTS	400	126	600	200	74
DEVON	3,931	513	5,000	1,069	556
DIDSBURY	3,219	378	3,500	281	-97
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	480	8,000	3,018	2,538
ECKVILLE	842	66	1,500	658	592
EDSON	7,110	1,227	10,000	2,890	1,663
FAIRVIEW	3,234	729	5,000	1,766	1,037
FOREMOST	617	309	1,200	583	274
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	267	1,200	986	719
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	936	6,000	2,861	1,925
FOX CREEK	1,978	540	3,000	1,022	482
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	885	10,000	5,376	4,491
GRANUM	399	69	1,500	1,101	1,032
HANNA	3,036	171	5,000	1,964	1,793
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	351	5,000	2,148	1,797
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	342	5,000	2,420	2,078
HIGH RIVER	5,114	237	12,000	6,886	6,649
HYTHE	681	351	1,500	819	468
INNISFAIL	5,435	522	8,000	2,565	2,043
IRVINE	360	513	1,000	640	127
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	186	4,500	2,258	2,072
LACOMBE	5,954	753	7,000	1,046	293
LINDEN	461	147	1,500	1,039	892
LOMOND	204	138	1,000	796	658
MANNING	1,262	234	3,000	1,738	1,504
MANNVILLE	799	186	1,300	501	315
MORINVILLE	5,273	774	5,500	227	-547
NAMPA	435	162	2,500	2,065	1,903
NOBLEFORD	547	51	1,200	653	602
OLDS	4,932	987	12,000	7,068	6,081
ONOWAY	669	261	1,500	831	570
PICTURE BUTTE	1,362	72	2,300	938	866
PLAMONDON	271	162	1,000	729	567
REDWATER	2,197	264	5,000	2,803	2,539
ROCKYFORD	292	51	2,300	2,208	2,157
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	279	1,500	335	56
ST. PAUL	5,052	201	8,000	2,948	2,747
STANDARD	379	90	900	521	431
STETTLER	5,135	774	6,000	864	90
STRATHMORE	3,330	1,782	4,000	670	-1,312
SWAN HILLS	2,497	651	4,000	1,503	852
THORHILD	566	162	1,500	934	772
THORSBY	737	288	2,000	1,263	975
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	192	2,300	1,002	810
TWO HILLS	1,330	531	1,500	170	-361
VULCAN	1,507	495	3,000	1,493	998
WARBURG	552	276	1,500	948	672
WHITECOURT	5,408	843	8,000	2,592	1,749
TOTALS	141,178	25,836	270,670	129,492	103,656

TABLE 4.3.2

SEWAGE TREATMENT SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS
(ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Add'l Pop'n if Vacant & Dev'g Lots Occupied	Sewer Treatment Design Pop'n	Capacity: Am't left for Add'l Pop Growth	Am't left if all Vac Lots Occ'd
STRATHMORE	3,530	1,782	4,000	470	-1,312
MORINVILLE	5,273	774	5,500	227	-547
TWO HILLS	1,330	531	1,500	170	-361
CALMAR	1,137	315	1,120	-17	-332
BEISEKER	648	183	600	-48	-231
DIDSBURY	3,219	378	3,500	281	-97
CAYLEY	232	42	250	18	-24
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	279	1,500	335	56
COUTTS	400	126	600	200	74
STETTLER	5,136	774	6,000	864	90
IRVINE	360	513	1,000	640	127
BOYLE	703	93	1,000	297	204
CORONATION	1,268	18	1,500	232	214
FOREMOST	617	309	1,200	583	274
LACOMBE	5,954	753	7,000	1,046	293
MANNVILLE	799	186	1,300	501	315
BARNWELL	373	54	800	427	373
STANDARD	379	90	900	521	431
HYTHE	681	351	1,500	819	468
FOX CREEK	1,978	540	3,000	1,022	482
ALIX	837	180	1,500	663	483
DEVON	3,931	513	5,000	1,069	556
BRETON	534	108	1,200	666	558
PLAMONDON	271	162	1,000	729	567
ONOWAY	669	261	1,500	831	570
ECKVILLE	842	66	1,500	658	592
NOBLEFORD	547	51	1,200	653	602
LOMOND	204	138	1,000	796	658
WARBURG	552	276	1,500	948	672
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	267	1,200	986	719
BOWDEN	983	267	2,000	1,017	750
THORHILD	566	162	1,500	934	772
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	192	2,300	1,002	810
CLYDE	406	279	1,500	1,094	815
SWAN HILLS	2,497	651	4,000	1,503	852
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	72	2,500	938	866
LINDEN	461	147	1,500	1,039	892
THORSBY	737	288	2,000	1,263	975
VULCAN	1,507	495	3,000	1,493	998
GRANUM	399	69	1,500	1,101	1,032
FAIRVIEW	3,234	729	5,000	1,766	1,037
MANNING	1,262	234	3,000	1,738	1,504
EDSON	7,110	1,227	10,000	2,890	1,663
WHITECOURT	5,408	843	8,000	2,592	1,749
HANNA	3,036	171	5,000	1,964	1,793
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	351	5,000	2,148	1,797
NAMPA	435	162	2,500	2,065	1,903
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	936	6,000	2,861	1,925
INNISFAIL	5,435	522	8,000	2,565	2,043
ATHABASCA	1,933	522	4,500	2,567	2,045
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	186	4,500	2,258	2,072
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	342	5,000	2,420	2,078
ROCKYFORD	292	51	2,500	2,208	2,157
BASHAW	875	192	3,500	2,625	2,433
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	480	8,000	3,018	2,538
REDWATER	2,197	264	5,000	2,803	2,539
ST. PAUL	5,052	201	8,000	2,948	2,747
CARSTAIRS	1,725	207	5,000	3,275	3,068
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	885	10,000	5,376	4,491
BROOKS	9,421	747	16,000	6,579	5,832
OLDS	4,932	987	12,000	7,068	6,081
BRUDERHEIM	1,338	576	8,000	6,762	6,186
CANMORE	4,012	1,665	12,000	7,988	6,323
HIGH RIVER	5,114	237	12,000	6,886	6,649
BARRHEAD	3,849	384	20,000	16,151	15,767
TOTALS	141,178	23,836	270,670	129,492	103,656

TABLE 4.4.1

SEWER TRUNK SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Add'l Pop'n if Vacant & Dev'g Lots Occupied	Sewer Trunk Capacity: Design Pop'n	Am't left for Add'l Pop Growth	Am't left if all Vac Lots Occ'd
ALIX	837	180	1,500	663	483
ATHABASCA	1,933	522	4,000	2,067	1,545
BARNWELL	373	54	800	427	373
BARRHEAD	3,849	384	5,800	1,951	1,567
BASHAW	875	192	1,500	625	433
BEISEKER	648	183	600	-48	-231
BOWDEN	983	267	1,500	517	250
BRETON	534	108	1,200	666	558
BROOKS	9,421	747	10,000	579	-168
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	576	3,000	1,762	1,186
CANMORE	4,012	1,665	16,000	11,988	10,323
CARSTAIRS	1,725	207	12,000	10,275	10,068
CAYLEY	232	42	250	18	-24
CLYDE	406	279	1,500	1,094	815
CORONATION	1,268	18	1,500	232	214
COUTTS	400	126	600	200	74
DEVON	3,931	513	10,000	6,069	5,556
DIDSBURY	3,219	378	4,000	781	403
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	480	8,000	3,018	2,538
ECKVILLE	842	66	1,500	658	592
EDSON	7,110	1,227	15,000	7,890	6,663
FAIRVIEW	3,234	729	4,000	766	37
FOREMOST	617	309	800	183	-126
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	267	1,200	986	719
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	936	4,000	861	-75
FOX CREEK	1,978	540	3,000	1,022	482
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	885	6,500	1,876	991
GRANUM	399	69	1,500	1,101	1,032
HANNA	3,036	171	5,000	1,964	1,793
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	351	5,000	2,148	1,797
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	342	3,000	420	78
HIGH RIVER	5,114	237	6,000	886	649
HYTHE	681	351	800	119	-232
INNISFAIL	5,435	522	8,000	2,565	2,043
IRVINE	360	513	1,000	640	127
LAC LA BICHE	2,262	186	4,500	2,238	2,052
LACOMBE	5,934	753	7,500	1,566	793
LINDEN	461	147	1,000	539	392
MANNING	1,262	234	3,000	1,738	1,504
MANNVILLE	799	186	1,300	501	315
MORINVILLE	5,273	774	25,000	19,727	18,953
NAMPA	413	162	500	65	-97
NOBLEFORD	547	51	500	53	2
OLDS	6,932	987	8,000	1,068	81
ONOWAY	669	261	1,500	831	570
PICTURE BUTTE	1,362	72	2,300	938	866
REDWATER	2,197	264	5,000	2,803	2,539
RIMBEY	1,906	447	2,800	894	447
ROCKYFORD	292	51	800	508	457
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	279	1,500	335	56
ST. PAUL	5,052	201	12,000	6,948	6,747
STANDARD	379	90	900	521	431
STETTLER	5,136	774	10,000	4,864	4,090
STRATHMORE	3,530	1,782	5,000	1,470	-312
SWAN HILLS	2,497	651	3,000	503	-148
THORHILD	566	162	600	34	-128
THORSBY	737	288	1,500	763	475
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	192	2,300	1,002	810
TWO HILLS	1,330	531	1,500	170	-361
VULCAN	1,507	495	3,000	1,493	998
WARBURG	332	276	1,000	668	172
WHITECOURT	5,408	843	12,000	6,592	5,749
TOTALS	140,769	25,575	266,350	125,581	100,006

TABLE 6.6.2

SEWER TRUNK SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS
(ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Add'l Pop'n if Vacant & Dev'g Lots Occupied	Sewer Trunk Capacity: Design Pop'n	Am't left for Add'l Pop Growth	Am't left if all Vac Lots Occ'd
TWO HILLS	1,330	531	1,500	170	-361
STRATHMORE	3,530	1,782	5,000	1,470	-312
MYTHE	681	351	800	119	-232
BEISEKER	608	183	600	-08	-231
BROOKS	9,421	747	10,000	579	-168
SWAN HILLS	2,497	651	3,000	503	-148
THORHILD	566	162	600	3o	-128
FOREMOST	617	309	800	183	-126
NAMPA	435	162	500	65	-97
FORT MACLEOD	3,139	936	4,000	861	-75
CAYLEY	232	42	250	18	-24
NOBLEFORD	547	51	600	53	1
FAIRVIEW	3,234	729	4,000	766	37
SMOKY LAKE	1,163	279	1,500	333	56
COUTTS	400	126	600	200	74
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	342	3,000	420	78
OLDS	4,932	987	6,000	1,068	81
IRVINE	360	513	1,000	640	127
WARBURG	552	276	1,000	448	172
CORONATION	1,268	18	1,500	232	214
BOWDEN	983	267	1,300	317	250
MANNVILLE	799	186	1,300	501	315
BARNWELL	373	54	800	427	373
LINDEN	461	147	1,000	539	392
DIDSBURY	3,219	378	4,000	781	403
STANDARD	379	90	900	52	431
BASHAW	875	192	1,500	625	433
RIMBEY	1,906	447	2,800	894	447
ROCKYFORD	292	51	800	508	457
THORSBY	737	288	1,500	763	475
FOX CREEK	1,978	540	3,000	1,022	482
ALIX	837	180	1,500	663	483
BRETON	534	108	1,200	666	558
ONOWAY	669	261	1,500	831	570
ECKVILLE	842	66	1,500	658	592
HIGH RIVER	5,114	237	6,000	886	649
FORT ASSINIBOINE	214	267	1,200	986	719
LACOMBE	5,934	753	7,500	1,566	793
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	192	2,300	1,002	810
CLYDE	406	279	1,500	1,094	815
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	72	2,500	938	866
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	885	6,500	1,876	991
VULCAN	1,507	495	3,000	1,493	998
GRANUM	399	69	1,500	1,101	1,032
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	576	3,000	1,762	1,186
MANNING	1,262	234	3,000	1,738	1,504
ATHABASCA	1,933	522	4,000	2,067	1,545
BARRHEAD	3,849	384	5,800	1,951	1,567
HANNA	3,036	171	5,000	1,964	1,793
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	351	5,000	2,148	1,797
INNISFAIL	5,435	522	8,000	2,565	2,043
LAC LA BICHE	2,262	186	4,500	2,238	2,052
DRAYTON VALLEY	4,982	480	8,000	3,018	2,538
REDWATER	3,197	264	5,000	2,803	2,539
STETTLER	5,136	774	10,000	4,864	4,090
DEVON	3,931	513	10,000	6,069	5,556
WHITECOURT	5,408	843	12,000	6,592	5,749
EDSON	7,110	1,227	15,000	7,890	6,663
ST. PAUL	5,052	201	12,000	6,948	6,747
CARSTAIRS	1,725	207	12,000	10,275	10,068
CANMORE	4,012	1,665	16,000	11,988	10,323
MORINVILLE	5,273	774	25,000	19,727	18,953
TOTALS	140,769	25,575	366,350	125,581	100,006

TABLE 4.5.1

STORM WATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS
(ordered by municipal name)

Municipality	1985 Pop'n	Add'l Pop'n if Vacant & Dev'g Lots Occupied	Storm Water Capacity: Design Pop'n	Am't left for Add'l Pop Growth	Am't left if all Vac Lots Occ'd
ALIX	837	180	1,500	663	483
ATHABASCA	1,933	522	4,500	2,567	2,045
BARRHEAD	3,849	384	5,800	1,951	1,567
BASHAW	875	192	1,500	625	433
BEISEKER	648	183	1,000	352	169
BOWDEN	983	267	1,500	517	250
BROOKS	9,421	747	10,000	579	-168
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	576	3,000	1,762	1,186
CORONATION	1,268	18	2,000	732	714
COUTTS	400	126	600	200	74
DEVON	3,931	513	10,000	6,069	5,556
DIDSBURY	3,219	378	5,000	1,781	1,403
ECKVILLE	842	66	1,000	158	92
EDSON	7,110	1,227	10,000	2,890	1,663
FAIRVIEW	3,234	729	3,500	266	-463
FOX CREEK	1,978	540	3,000	1,022	482
GIBBONS	2,620	582	3,700	1,080	498
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	885	6,500	1,876	991
HANNA	3,036	171	5,000	1,964	1,793
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	351	5,000	2,148	1,797
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	342	3,000	420	78
HIGH RIVER	5,114	237	12,000	6,886	6,649
INNISFAIL	5,435	522	10,000	4,565	4,043
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	186	1,000	-1,242	-1,428
LACOMBE	5,954	753	7,500	1,546	793
MORINVILLE	5,273	774	25,000	19,727	18,953
NAMPA	435	162	500	65	-97
OLDS	4,932	987	6,000	1,068	81
ONOWAY	669	261	1,500	831	570
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	72	5,000	3,438	3,366
RIMBEY	1,906	447	2,800	894	447
ROCKYFORD	292	51	800	508	457
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	279	1,500	335	56
ST. PAUL	5,052	201	10,000	4,948	4,747
STETTLER	5,136	774	10,000	4,864	4,090
STRATHMORE	3,530	1,782	5,000	1,470	-312
SWAN HILLS	2,497	651	3,000	503	-148
THORSBY	737	288	1,500	763	475
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	192	2,300	1,002	810
VULCAN	1,507	495	3,000	1,493	998
WHITECOURT	5,408	843	12,000	6,592	5,749
TOTALS	117,622	18,936	207,500	89,878	70,942

TABLE 4.3.2

STORM WATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM CAPACITY ANALYSIS
(ordered by system capacity remaining if all vacant and proposed residential lots occupied)

Municipality	1983 Pop'n	Add'l Pop'n if Vacant & Dev'g Lots Occupied	Storm Water Capacity: Design Pop'n	Am't left for Add'l Pop Growth	Am't left if all Vac Lots Occ'd
LAC LA BICHE	2,242	186	1,000	-1,242	-1,428
FAIRVIEW	3,234	729	3,500	266	-463
STRATHMORE	3,530	1,782	5,000	1,470	-312
BROOKS	9,421	747	10,000	579	-168
SWAN HILLS	2,697	651	3,000	303	-148
NAMPA	435	162	500	65	-97
SMOKY LAKE	1,165	279	1,500	335	56
COUTTS	400	126	600	200	74
HIGH PRAIRIE	2,580	342	3,000	420	78
OLDS	4,932	987	6,000	1,068	81
ECKVILLE	842	66	1,000	158	92
BEISEKER	648	183	1,000	352	169
BOWDEN	983	267	1,500	517	250
BASHAW	875	192	1,500	625	433
RIMBEY	1,906	447	2,800	894	447
ROCKYFORD	292	51	800	508	457
THORSBY	737	288	1,500	763	475
FOX CREEK	1,978	540	3,000	1,022	482
ALIX	837	180	1,500	663	483
GIBBONS	2,620	582	3,700	1,080	498
ONOWAY	669	261	1,500	831	570
CORONATION	1,268	18	3,000	732	714
LACOMBE	5,954	753	7,500	1,546	793
TURNER VALLEY	1,298	192	3,300	1,002	810
GRANDE CACHE	4,624	885	6,500	1,876	991
VULCAN	1,507	495	3,000	1,493	998
BRUDERHEIM	1,238	576	3,000	1,762	1,186
DIDSBURY	3,219	378	5,000	1,781	1,403
BARRHEAD	3,849	384	5,800	1,951	1,567
EDSON	7,110	1,327	10,000	2,890	1,563
HANNA	3,036	171	5,000	1,964	1,793
HIGH LEVEL	2,852	351	5,000	2,148	1,797
ATHABASCA	1,933	533	4,300	2,367	2,043
PICTURE BUTTE	1,562	72	5,000	3,438	3,366
INNISFAIL	5,435	523	10,000	4,565	4,043
STETTLER	5,136	774	10,000	4,864	4,090
ST. PAUL	5,052	201	10,000	4,948	4,747
DEVON	3,931	513	10,000	6,069	5,556
WHITECOURT	5,408	843	12,000	6,592	5,749
HIGH RIVER	5,114	237	12,000	6,886	6,649
MORINVILLE	5,273	774	25,000	19,727	18,953
TOTALS	117,632	18,936	207,900	89,878	70,942